

A HISTORICAL MEANING
OF SPARTACUS' UPRISING

MASAOKI DOI

TOKYO JAPAN

1977

スパルタクスの蜂起

古代ローマの奴隷戦争



奴隷制的支配の上にそびえる古代ローマ「帝国」を震撼させた最大の奴隷蜂起の全容——剣闘士奴隷の脱走、蜂起の拡大、解放への展望の模索と戦闘、「帝国」辺境の民族的反乱との関係、そして敗北——を平易な文体で生き生きと再現するとともに、共和政ローマの変質と蜂起の歴史的意義を究明する注目の書下し！

¥ 900.

青木書店

A HISTORICAL MEANING OF SPARTACUS' UPRISING MASAOKI DOI

I. Definition of Problems

We know that the name "Spartacus" has kept on living till today along with the history of liberation of the oppressed peoples and races. For instance, according to Karl Marx, "Spartacus erscheint als der famoseste Kerl, den die ganze antike Geschichte aufzuweisen hat. Grosser General (Kein Garibaldi), nobler Charakter, real representative des antiken Proletariats.⁽¹⁾" And, Vladimir I. Lenin praised the uprising led by Spartacus as a "war of justice"⁽²⁾.

What could be the reason for this long survival of the name "Spartacus"? In ancient Roma, slave uprisings were not a few happenings, and among them, there were some which were much bigger in scale and longer termed than the one by Spartacus. The first or the second Sicilian slave uprising is one of such examples. Yet, the names of these revolt leaders, "Eunus" and "Athenion" are not so familiar to us as "Spartacus". Why have the names of other revolt leaders not remained any more, but the name of Spartacus today as a sole representative of a number of slave revolt leaders?

It is a fact that, Spartacus' Uprising risen in Italia, makes Roman Republic stand at a great crisis and whole ruling class of Roma fall into panic and consider Spartacus as another Hannibal⁽³⁾. However, if we think it as the sole reason for the survival of his name, it only explains half the reason why his name is still alive and remain as a symbol for liberation of the oppressed class. The problem is what was this uprising. The "Something" which originated from the real substance of the uprising, has made his name immortal among many other slave uprisings and has stimulated the oppressed to have strength to go on. Trying to find out this "Something" is the main object of this article.

(1) *Marx-Engels Werke* 30, Berlin, S. 160

(2) *Lenin Werke* 28, Moskva, S. 61

(3) Horatius, *Odae* III, 19; Ampelius XLV, 3; Eutropius VI, 7, 2; Ammianus Marcellinus XVII, 33; Claudianus, *Bell. Goth.* 155 f; Orosius V, 24, 5

II. The Cause of Defeat in Spartacus' Uprising

In order to try to find out this "Something" of Spartacus' Uprising, this paper is to start with probing the cause of the defeat of the uprising. This might seem as a rather roundabout way, but to be

effective to approach the problem.

Why were the Roman rulers able to put down Spartacus' Uprising? The cause of defeat was said due to the immaturity of the objective circumstances surrounding the uprising. In the first century B.C., for the sake of the poor productive power of labour, slave uprisings could not destroy the social structure based on slavery, and construct a new mode of production. Therefore, the slaves could not hold the intention of freeing themselves by the way of becoming colonus ⁽¹⁾. They did not understand the class-consciousness and the true meaning of uprising ⁽²⁾. Therefore, the slave uprisings had such characteristics, as to broken out spontaneously, sporadically and locally ⁽³⁾. Those points should be counted as the cause for their defeat. Even though it is very important to study the uprising on their social, economic and political background, putting these problems aside, this paper is to find out the cause of this defeat by the means of analyzing Spartacus' Army and its subjective conditions. On the way of analyzing those subject matters, their background would come up subsequently.

In this study, I would not take up the problem as class consciousness of spontaneousness of slave uprisings in general, but would deal with definite conditions specific to Spartacus' Army. Most modern historians have thought the cause of defeat as discord and disagreements within Spartacus' Army. Nobody would oppose to admit this discord as the cause of defeat if we would disregard the objective matters of the uprising.

What were the bases for judging this discord as the cause of defeat? Firstly, after the slave army, led by Spartacus, dominated South Italia, they started to march back towards the North to let the slaves go home lands. At that time, a unit led by Crixos separated from Spartacus, main force, and was destroyed by a Roman Army ⁽⁴⁾. Secondly, when Spartacus' Army failed to cross to Sicilia, they broke through a siege by a Roman general Crassus, and they tried their last effort to march to Brundisium. But then, Cannicus and Castus separated from the main force and were consequently destroyed by the Roman Army ⁽⁵⁾. Both these occasions were taken place on turning-points for Spartacus' Uprising ⁽⁶⁾. These are the reasons that the historians think them as a result of discord and disagreements among Spartacus' Army.

Concerning the cause for this discord and disagreements there are various opinions among the historians. In an opinion, the cause for the discord is pointed as a conflict between Spartacus and the mass of slaves. W. Drumann, C. Neumann, L. Ferrero, C. O. Ward and H. Wallon are of this opinion. Drumann says, "die Sklaven verwirrten und vereitelten seinen Plan; er wünschte ihnen ein Vaterland wiederzugeben,

und sie verlangten nach Beute und Rache.....⁽⁷⁾."

Neumann⁽⁸⁾, Ward⁽⁹⁾ and Wallon⁽¹⁰⁾ also have a similar opinion as Drumann's. By Ferrero, "Spartacus was a military genius and had worked miracles; but his heterogeneous army could not hold out indefinitely. Discord and desertion came to Crassus' aid,"⁽¹¹⁾

This opinion is derived from ancient writers', praising Spartacus as a hero and genius, while looking down the mass of slaves as a foolish crowd. Therefore, they take this discord of Spartacus' Army to be a conflict between genius Spartacus and the contemptible slave mass⁽¹²⁾.

In a second opinion, they point out the cause of discord as racial and tribal conflicts in his army. T. Mommsen, J. Most, R. Bonghi, W. E. Heitland, M. Ollivier and J. Vogt support this opinion. S. J. Kovalev of Soviet Russia also has this opinion⁽¹³⁾. For, by Mommsen, "wovon wohl die Ursache darin zu suchen ist, daß die sicilischen Sklaven in dem gemeinsamen Syrohellenismus einer gleichsam nationalen Einigungspunkt fanden, die italischen dagegen in die beiden Massen der Hellenobaren und der Keltogermanen sich schieden. Die Spaltung zwischen dem Kelten Krixos und dem Traker Spartacus — lähmte die Benutzung der errungenen Erfolge und verschaffte den Römern manchen wichtigen Sieg⁽¹⁴⁾." According to J. Most, "Den Zankapfel bildete die Nationalitätenfrage: Was früher auf Sicilien wiederholt geschah, das unterblieb hier; es wollte sich kein Anführer dem andern unterordnen. Die Kelten wollten von dem Thrakien Spartakus nichts mehr wissen und kämpften unter der Leitung ihres Landsmannes Krixos auf eigene Faust. Dieser Eigensinn trug bald traurige Früchte⁽¹⁵⁾." By Bonghi, "ma nè da principio erano stati concordi ed malanimo tra i Galli e Germani da una parte e i Traci dall' altra non aveva fatto che crescere. — La vittoria di Crasso fu resa più facile da ciò, che il seme di discordia nell'esercito di Spartaco era ripullulato. La diversità di patria, tra quegli i quali ne facevano parte di costumi, di voglie, compressa per poco, ripigliò lena, come suole quando la fortuna scema⁽¹⁶⁾."

In this opinion, when the cause of discord was explained as disagreement between Celts and Thracians, or Hellenistic barbarians versus Celts and Germans, in either case it is recognized as racial and tribal conflicts within the slave army.

On the other hand, the opinion of Heitland⁽¹⁷⁾, Ollivier⁽¹⁸⁾ and Vogt⁽¹⁹⁾ is: This racial and tribal conflict was easily brought forth by the structure of Spartacus' Army which had been divided by each racial group. That is to say, in the Army, there was a unit of Celts and Germans, and another unit of the Thracians. And the former unit wanted to keep fighting with Romans and march into Roma, while the latter unit wanted to let slaves go home. This view is interesting because

they attributed the conflict to the structure of the Army. But this opinion is same as Mommsen's, Most's and Bonghi's on the point of taking the cause of discord due to the racial and tribal conflict.

Third opinion is represented by A. W. Mischulin's ⁽²⁰⁾, attributing the cause of discord to conflicts between slaves and peasants who joined this army. He has a hypothetical idea that downfall peasant class might have joined the army in a large scale, and the conflicts between slaves and peasants should have to be the cause for the discord. Namely, he takes Spartacus as a representative of slave class and Crixos and other leaders as representatives of those peasants. As they were in unity with the slave mass, Spartacus' group had an intention to make the slaves free and go back home. Meanwhile, Crixos group was keeping the tie with peasants... So their plan was to expel the large landowners, to acquire the land, and to share it among them in the end. This means Spartacus' Uprising had been assigned double tasks. And these tasks should have been carried out under the leadership of the slave class. But peasants did not understand that their aim would be accomplished only after the dissolution of the society based on the slavery. Under this condition, it was impossible to satisfy both slaves and peasants at once. Mischulin thinks that the difference of the programs between slaves and peasants caused the discord in Spartacus' Army, and the failure to unify these two groups led Spartacus' Uprising into defeat.

This view of Mischulin's is very attractive and much better than other two opinions because it refers the cause of discord to the background of its society. Soviet historians, such as V. S. Sergeev, N. A. Maschkin, etc. agree with his view on the point that the cause of discord as not in racial and tribal but in social background ⁽²¹⁾.

These are the three basic opinions which conclude the discord was due to the structure of Spartacus' Army itself. There is an other view which takes the cause as a compound of the primary factors in the above three opinions. For instance, Hidemichi Ohta points out two factors, such as difference of slaves' home lands and difference of the standpoint between slaves and peasants to be the cause of discord and disunity ⁽²²⁾. And then there is another opinion like P. Oliva's, Czechoslovakian historian. He finds the cause in the difference between the slaves who had lived long in Italia and the other slaves who kept remembering their living conditions at home lands ⁽²³⁾. According to Oliva, those slaves who had been in Roma for a long time, wanted to gain freedom in Italia... that is... to fight against Roma. And the rest of the slaves wanted to go back home lands. Even though there are some varieties, the cause of discord could be explained in above three opinions.

From these three opinions, we learn one element common to them. Though the first one take the cause of discord between the slave leaders and the mass of slaves, the second one between Celts-Germans and Thracians, the third one between slaves and peasants, they all think the cause due to the difference and contradiction of the plans and purposes in the army. The slave leader Spartacus in the first opinion, Thracians in the second, and the slaves in the third opinion, wanted to go back home lands. On the other side, slave mass, Celts-Germans, or the peasants wanted to stay, plunder and revenge in Italia and to have land-shares, and march into Roma. However, among the historians of the second opinion — that is, taking the cause of discord as racial and tribal conflicts — there is one like Vogt who refers the racial conflicts lay in the difference of their executing programs. But there are another group of historians like Most and Mommsen, who deny the direct relations between the two, even though they are conscious of the problem among Spartacus' Army men, whether they should get out of Italia or stay in Italia. Most refers the former as "Die Minderheit" and the latter as "Die Mehrheit", and none of them have direct relation to racial conflicts. He thinks that Spartacus' Army moved back and forth between those two according to the balance of their powers ⁽²⁴⁾. Mommsen pointed out that "der Mangel eines festen Planes und Zieles" played a very important role for their defeat. Thus, attributing the cause of discord on racial and tribal conflicts, he did not connect this idea with the disagreements in the program for their action. His opinion was caused from the historical facts which suggest that the cause of discord was, basically, not originated from racial and tribal conflicts. But let me mention it later. Moreover, Plutarch says, "Spartacus handled the affair adequately and tried to let the slaves free from the Alps to their home lands, but his subordinates would not listen to him and raided around Italia ⁽²⁵⁾." And Sallustius says, "Spartacus' men ignored the order and revenged, plundered and acted mercilessly toward the natives in full vigour ⁽²⁶⁾."

In short, taking the historical condition of the time into account, the point where these three opinions have differentiated would depend upon how to understand the relation between the following two facts or to estimate them on a whole course of the historical conditions of those days; one fact is that Spartacus' Army had separating groups on an important time and that some of his members repeated revenges and plunders towards the inhabitants in the other fact.

These opinions that attribute the discord of Spartacus' Army to its structure, take difference of structure and disagreements of executing programs as related to each other. If the relation was not direct, they

had to accept it as the actual disagreements in their programs. Therefore, it enables us to attack the problem from the other side, namely, from the point of the disagreements of their actual programs.

Even when the varieties of the structure of Spartacus' Army was the cause of discord, other factors would enlarge this discord. For instance, Kovalev points out insufficient regulations in Celts-Germans elements⁽²⁷⁾. M. Beer points out the desire of plunder in Spartacus' Army.⁽²⁸⁾ Ward points out the personal envy of Crixos against Spartacus⁽²⁹⁾. E.G. Kagarov points out the disagreements and distrust between Spartacus and ambitious Crixos who had come to doubt the other as a traitor⁽³⁰⁾. But, the more important suggestion was presented after the World War II.

L. Pareti of Italia points out that the breakup was only superficial. He refers the so-called 'breakup' between Spartacus and Crixos as the distribution of their duty and responsibility. For, after the 'breakup', when Crixos died in the battle, Spartacus mourned and hold a ritual, honoring his spirit. This should be a good proof that they were in a good term till the end. And as for Castus and Cannicus, they were not desertors but they were only separated as a rear-guard unit⁽³¹⁾. J. P. Brisson agrees with this opinion⁽³²⁾. According to him, there was no conflicts between slave leaders and slave mass, the Celts-Germans and the Thracians, nor slaves and peasants, and there was no conflicts basically in the Army.

A. A. Motus and D. B. Ratner of Soviet Russia have almost similar opinion. Both of them have such a view that there was no disagreements existed in the program of slave liberation in Spartacus' Army. The disagreements only existed in their maneuvering procedure and strategic plans or tactics⁽³³⁾. Criticizing the second and the third opinions which take the cause of discord as conflicts among races and tribes, or slaves against peasants, Motus takes those two tactical plans as a mere contrast of slaves getting out from Italia and of marching toward Roma. And these two plans should be understood as a whole in the programs of the slave liberation, not as hostility between them, for without destroying Roma, there could not be an escape from Italia⁽³⁴⁾. In the process of the uprising, Spartacus had to decide which maneuver would be better under the situation. Restricted by the slaves' action, his plan would be changeable... sometimes to march into Roma, and other times to get out from Italia as the situation varied⁽³⁵⁾. According to interpreting the situation along with tactics and strategies, there grew a discord. The basis of discord did not lie in a conflict like racial disagreements or slaves against peasants, but was formed by complicated factors in the problems among the conquered slaves, the Roman born slaves, as

well as among the cultural level of the slaves and peasants who had joined the uprising ⁽³⁶⁾. Both Ratner and Motus think that Spartacus planned a strategic escape from Italia as a basis of liberation program, but did not oppose to march toward Roma to work out this strategy effectively, and to give a great damage to Roma. The quarrel between Spartacus and Crixos was not arisen from their programs nor their common aims, but from the tactics of fighting with the enemy ⁽³⁷⁾. According to this opinion, discord and disagreement did not exist on the basis of program, but remained only as a secondary or subordinate problem. Therefore, they were not considered very important for the defeat of Spartacus' Army. In this way, there are some differences either in the opinion regarding the cause of defeat as discord in the Army, or in the opinion insisting no disagreement in the Army, although the latter is trying to find a rational interpretation of the separation and discord in the historical materials. In order to criticize these opinions, let me start with analyzing the structure of Spartacus' Army first and see if there was any cause for the discord there.

- (1) P. Oliva, Die Charakteristischen Züge der grossen Sklavenaufstände zur Zeit der römischen Republik, *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt II*, Berlin, 1965, S.86; E. M. Schtaerman, *Rascvet rabovladelceskisch otnoshenij v Rimskoj respublike*, Moskva 1964, P.248; S. A. Zebelev and S.J. Kovalev: Velikie vosstanija rabov II-I vv. do n. e. v. Rime, *IGAIMK* 101, 1934, P.180
- (2) Kovalev, Veli. vosst. p. 180; Hajime Tamaki, Slave Uprising in Ancient Roma, *Shakaigaku Zasshi*, no.44, Tokyo 1927, pp. 78-79
- (3) Schtaerman, pp.247, 248; Kovalev, Veli. vosst, p.180; Tamaki, pp. 78, 79; K. M. Kolobova, Vosstanija rabov v antičnom obschestve V-I vv. do. n.e., *Problemii vceobschei istorii*, 1967 p.25
- (4) Plutarch, *Crassus* 9; Livius XCVI; Appianus, *B. C. I.* 117; Orosius V, 24,4
- (5) Plutarch, *Crassus* 11; Livius XCVII; Orosius V, 24,6
- (6) M. Doi, Reconstructing Spartacus Servile War, *Senshu Shigaku* 1,1968, pp.64, 92-94; At the first period, the point of debate was – either they should march up toward North or stay in South Italia ... And then in the second period, either march to Brundisium to leave from Italia, or stay in Italia and march toward Roma.
- (7) W. Drumann, *Geschichte Roms in seinem Übergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung*, 1838, IV, S.75
- (8) Carl Neumann, *Geschichte Roms während des Verfalls der Republik*, 1884, S.92
- (9) C. O. Ward, *Ancient Lowly*, New York, 1888, p.266, p.273, p.277
- (10) Henri Wallon, *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, Paris, 1879, p.425 (Russian Translation)
- (11) L. Ferrero, *Greatness and Decline of Rome*, I, p.174
- (12) E. G. Kagarov, *Spartak*, Moskva, 1924, p.19; As for the contradiction between Spartacus and slaves, he contrasts them as "long-sighted" and "short-sighted." But referring them as related to the program of their aim and action, he does not take the view of "hero" Spartacus and "contemptible" slave mass. Kolobova p.25 agrees with the view that the cause of discord existed in contradiction between Spartacus and slave mass.; G. Paladino, *La guerra dei Gladiatori*, Napoli, 1909

- (13) Kovalev, Veli. vosst. p.166; He points out that discord germinated on the soil of hostility among races; Tamaki, p.77 says, an army of heterogeneous slaves couldn't keep holding its unity; H. H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero*, London, 1959, p.95; B. Balwin, Two aspects of the Spartacus slave revolt, *The Classical Journal, Mensha/Ohio*, 1966, p.290; He also takes the cause of discord as racial conflicts.
- (14) T. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, III SS.86-87
- (15) J. Most, *Die sozialen Bewegungen in Alten Rom und Cäsarismus*, 1878, S.93
- (16) R. Bonghi, *Spartaco*, Napoli, 1880, p.17, p.23
- (17) W. E. Heitland, *The Roman Republic* III, Cambridge, 1923, p.13
- (18) M. Ollivier, *Spartacus*, Paris, 1929, pp.99-100
- (19) J. Vogt, *Struktur der antiken Sklavenkriege*, Wiesbaden, 1957, SS.37-38; But G. Tibiletti is criticizing Vogt, saying – it is no use trying to uplift the racial sentiments. *Gnomon*, Bd.31, Heft. 2, 1959, pp.149-152
- (20) A. W. Mischulin, *Spartakovskoe vosstanie*, Moskva, 1936, pp.134-141; Mischulin, *Spartacus*, Berlin, 1952, SS.65-74; Mischulin, *Revoljucija rabov i padenie Rimskoi respubliki*, Moskva, 1936 pp.78-83, 84, 27; H. J. Diesner agrees with Mischulin, *Kriege des Altertums*, Berlin, 1971, S.155
- (21) Schtaerman, p.242
- (22) Hidemichi Ohta, Mass and Hero, *Lectures on History*, III Tokyo, 1956, p.73
- (23) P. Oliva and V. Olivová, *Spartakus*, Praha, 1960, S.88
- (24) Most, S.92
- (25) Plutarch, *Crassus* 9
- (26) Sallustius III, 98
- (27) Kovalev, Veli. vosst. p.166
- (28) M. Beer, *Allgemeine Geschichte des Sozialismus und sozialen kampfes* (Japanese Translation) p.101
- (29) Ward p.265
- (30) Kagarov, p.20; F. A. Ridley, *Spartacus*, Kent, 1963; He also relates the disagreements among leaders with racial discord.
- (31) L. Pareti, *Storia di Roma*, Torino, 1953, III p.695,696,p.703
- (32) J. P. Brisson, *Spartacus*, Paris, 1959, pp.212-218; Schtaerman p.242 is skeptical about Brisson's opinion as he didn't accept the actual facts of disagreement between Spartacus and Crixos.
- (33) A. A. Motus-Bekker, Iz istorii vosstaniya Spartaka, *Uttchenie Zapiski Leningradskogo Gos. Instituta* 68, 1948, p.68; A. B. Ratner, K voprosy o pričinach raznoglasij v armii Spartaka, *UZ Karelo-finskogo Universiteta* vol.III. H. I., 1948, p.56
- (34) Motus, Iz istorii, p.71, p.74
- (35) Motus, Iz istorii, p.77
- (36) Motus, Iz istorii, p.74
- (37) Ratner, p.56, p.59

III. The Structure of Spartacus' Army

In order to analyze the structure of Spartacus' Army, we shall examine the class- or status- structure first, and then the racial- or tribal- structure. From the examination of the former, we may find an answer for the first and the third opinions above, and the examination of the latter may be informative to the second opinion.

The Class Structure

According to historical materials, Spartacus' Army was consisted of slaves and free men. Among slaves there were various kinds of status; on the other hand, free men were only very few. Among slaves there were such as; gladiators ⁽¹⁾, cowherds and shepherds ⁽²⁾, fugitives ⁽³⁾, armory forgers, shield makers ⁽⁴⁾, slaves from *ergastulum* (workshop) ⁽⁵⁾, a female prophet ⁽⁶⁾, a sacrifice-offering maiden ⁽⁷⁾, etc. As for free men, there were men from the fields ⁽⁸⁾, riff-raff ⁽⁹⁾, deserters from Roman Army, ⁽¹⁰⁾ etc. What kind of inevitability did they have for joining Spartacus' Army and how important role did they play in the army? On these problems we shall examine each of the about items.

(i) Slaves

(a) Gladiators

About seventy gladiators ^(10a) escaped from their gladiatorial training-school at Capua that originated Spartacus' Uprising. So, it was a fact that gladiators took part in the uprising, and those leaders such as Spartacus, Crixos, and Oenomaus were gladiators ⁽¹¹⁾. Gladiators were the slaves who had to be in a show at arena for Romans and had to fight and kill each other. At first, this was a custom in the countries such as Etruria that the warcaptives used to fight in honor of the dead in front of their graves ⁽¹²⁾. But after Romans conquered the Mediterranean Sea, development of slavery system made this particular custom a show-game for the citizens. Romans enjoyed to see the match of gladiators, throwing brutal abused on gladiators fighting with their last efforts, and embrasing abnormal adoration for the winner-survivors ⁽¹³⁾.

To please, flatter those decadent disposition of Roman citizens, and to bribe them, wealthy slave owners had many gladiators and presented their show for the citizens ⁽¹⁴⁾. To meet this demand, gladiatorial training-schools were built in various places. Managers of these schools bought in subordinate slaves or unsuccessful escapers cheaply, and trained and sold them as gladiators expensively to the wealthy or to the nobles ⁽¹⁵⁾. Managers of these schools looked for places where they could "raise" gladiators with cheap "fodders". Capua in Campania Plain

was just that kind of place ⁽¹⁶⁾. To survive, gladiators had to put up with their own cruel, inhuman destiny of killing their fellow members. The death of their fellow members could be their own fate tomorrow, so it is well imagined that they were very sensitive about their inhuman destiny ⁽¹⁷⁾, rebellious against their situation, and longing for their freedom and liberation. It really was a very symbolical for the Roman society that the uprising had arisen among none, but them who had been made a creature of shows for Romans and most contempted even among the slaves ⁽¹⁸⁾. As they were stout ⁽¹⁹⁾, and excelled in martial arts and strategies for their own occupation, they must have occupied a very important part ⁽²⁰⁾ as nucleus and leaders in the Army. But as the percentage of gladiators were very little among slaves in Italia, the numbers of those who joined the uprising couldn't have been very large, either. So, it is impossible to think that the main body of uprising could have been gladiators ⁽²¹⁾.

(b) Cowherds and Shepherds

Not only cowherds and shepherds but also horseherds ⁽²²⁾ must have joined the uprising. At the time, Southern Italia was very important pastoral land. Especially, much of the *ager publicus* had been turned into wealthy men's property, their own private property *de facto*. Most of the large private property became a pasture on slavery system. And this large pasture farming brought on extensive and careless management; and death and fugitives rate increased ⁽²³⁾. In this extensive farming, the increased death rate of slaves meant the decreased rations and severer conditions by compulsory labour which itself very hard one from the beginning ⁽²⁴⁾. Although under severe condition, the herdsmen were freer than with others who had been chained, for their job was to take care of roaming cattles and stocks. And their food could be supplied a little by hunting and picking in the hills and mountains, or milking the cattle stealthily ⁽²⁵⁾. The increasing death rate suggest the Roman wealthy forced them to impossible condition to live. Therefore, it was not accidental that there were frequent incidents in Southern Italia by herdsmen ⁽²⁶⁾. For the sake of their job of taking care of cattles, they might have to be armed with clubs and spears ⁽²⁷⁾, and most of them were strong and reckless. Under these conditions, it was inevitable that these herdsmen joined Spartacus' Army in great number with livestocks they were taking care of.

Plutarch says, "They were also joined by many of the herdsmen and shepherds of the region, sturdy men and swift of foot, some of whom they armed fully, and employed others as scouts and light infantry ⁽²⁸⁾." They must have played the indispensable role as horsemen in the uprising ⁽²⁹⁾ and a leading role in organizing the freight ⁽³⁰⁾ and

choosing the roads ⁽³¹⁾. The primary units of Spartacus' Army were organized ⁽³²⁾ when Spartacus was dominating Southern Italy most of which was the pasture land. But their number was not so many if compared the whole number of the herdsmen ⁽³³⁾.

(c) Fugitives

House-hold slaves and farm slaves in *latifundium* are included in this group. While Southern Italy was important for pasturing land, Campania, Lucania Apulia, etc. were important for agriculture. Slaves were employed for corn-cultivation, and *latifundium* developed in a large scale ⁽³⁴⁾. Agricultural slaves were compelled to work with chains at the *latifundium* from the well-known "slave jail (*ergastulum*)" under whips of the cruel managers ⁽³⁵⁾. About the time of Second Sicilian Slave Uprising, we can see several other slave revolts in Nuceria and Capua ⁽³⁶⁾. Therefore, it should be quite natural that the fugitives from their masters of from "*ergastulum*" and joined Spartacus' Army ⁽³⁷⁾. Agricultural slaves, who was most cruelly exploited by slave owners, must have occupied the largest part in the army and the core of the uprising ⁽³⁸⁾. It was the unit of the agricultural slaves who made Spartacus to a great leader. Strict training and collective labour in *ergastulum* and *latifundium* made them accomplish high discipline, and the unbearable collective labour under the cruel exploit made themselves firmly united as "comrade" beyond the difference of their races and tribes or of their cultures ⁽³⁹⁾. Numbers of house-hold slaves who joined the uprising is not clear, but can not be very large ⁽⁴⁰⁾.

(d) Armory forgers, Shield makers and Workshop slaves

The fact that those words are found in the historical materials denotes slaves from workshops also participated in Spartacus' Army. It is already known that there were handiworks of slaves for making such as ceramics ⁽⁴¹⁾, textiles ⁽⁴²⁾, agriculture tools ⁽⁴³⁾, bronze implements ⁽⁴⁴⁾, olive oil squeezing machines ⁽⁴⁵⁾, etc. around Capua, Nola, Pompei, Puteoli, Tarentum and other districts where the slave uprisings were supposed to have extended. It could be most probable that slaves who had escaped from these workshops made shields of wicker and of animal skin for themselves ⁽⁴⁶⁾. It is a unique example of this uprising that swords and other weapons were made by slaves themselves ⁽⁴⁷⁾, smelting the chains and iron taken out of their *ergastulum*. These slaves must have escaped from the iron factories around Puteoli ⁽⁴⁸⁾. The slaves who had been compelled for taking care of armors or farriery ⁽⁴⁹⁾ in Roman Army, must have escaped to join Spartacus' Army.

(e) A Female Prophet and a Sacrifice Offering Maiden

In what way did female slaves participate in the uprising? It is not clear except in the cases of prophet and sacrifice offerer. A female

prophet, Spartacus' wife is said to join the Dionysian esotericism ⁽⁵⁰⁾ and prophesied the future of Spartacus, and the latter is said to offer sacrifice for the allies in the camp of Cannicus and Castus ⁽⁵¹⁾. The duties of these female slaves seemed to have some connection ⁽⁵²⁾ with the position of female prophets in Celts-Germans society. As women were often seen in the battles of Gauls and Germans ⁽⁵³⁾, female slaves might have taken not only as prophets.

(ii) Free Men

(a) Free Men from the fields

The meaning of this phrase is not clear definitely. But these men must have been; small land owners who were declining in accordance with the expanse of *latifundia*, small lessees ⁽⁵⁴⁾ who were increasing after Military Reformation by Marius, or wage labourers ⁽⁵⁵⁾ employed for grape harvest, etc. A man of Picentini guided Spartacus' Army must be one of them ⁽⁵⁶⁾. Since the second century B.C., a numbers of medium or small scale peasants had come to lose their land, and the conflicts between the large land owners and those declining medium-small peasants became intensified. The Agricultural Law by Tiberius Gracchus was executed in the districts of Picenum, Lucania and Campania against the strong objection of large land owners ⁽⁵⁷⁾. It is very incredible the intensity of this conflict made the medium and small land owners run to Spartacus' Army. Therefore "free men from the fields", should be limited to the poorest peasants of small lessees and wage labourers. Judging from the context of the word "free men from the fields" in Appianus, the district must be near Campania, and it was at the harvest, a busiest season, when the uprising broke out first ⁽⁵⁸⁾. It might be fully probable that, stimulated by escaping slaves these poorest peasant employed by the large land owner joined the revolt.

(b) Riff-raff

It is not clear the difference between "free men from the fields" and "riff-raff". As we have seen in the description by Appianus, the word "free men from the fields" was used around Campania region only, but "riff-raff" was used all over Southern Italy around the time of 73 B.C. from autumn to winter ⁽⁵⁹⁾. We cannot deny the possibility that these "riff-raff" joined the Army all the course of uprising, and, in this sense, "free men from the fields" might be included here. But "riff-raff" would better be described as *proletarii*. Declined *proletarii*, having given up their land were swarming in cities like Roma. Yet, Roman ruling class was taking special care to them, and *proletarii* themselves discriminated themselves from slaves and was contempting them. Moreover, Appianus says — no city had joined Spartacus' Army ⁽⁶⁰⁾ —, so that city *proletarii* would have not joined Spartacus' Army. If so,

“riff-raff” here, must have been local *proletarii*, especially from Southern Italia. It must be appropriate to think these “riff-raff” here as the Italians ⁽⁶¹⁾ who had been chased out of their farms by Law of Sulla after the Italian Social War, and driven into miserable conditions.

(c) Deserters from Roman Army

After Reformation of Military System by Marius, not only land owning citizens but also anybody who wanted to, could join Roman Army if they were suitable enough for military service. It enabled to declined peasants and *proletarii* to join the army ⁽⁶²⁾ and later they were the main constituents there. Therefore, deserters from Roman Army were in the same groupe of people “free men from the fields” and “riff-raff”. If they might have joined Spartacus’ Army, that had to be because of the fear for the mighty strength of slave army, or because of their miserable living condition which had driven them to the military camps. But the number of these men is not very large. As Spartacus refused to accept these deserters after a certain period ⁽⁶³⁾, they might be “unwelcomed guests” for Spartacus’ Army.

We have analyzed the structure of social status of Spartacus’ Army. Although we have found overwhelming majority of slaves in Spartacus’ Army, the percentage of slaves versus free men have remained unknown. Therefore, we cannot give direct answer for the first and the third opinions. It will discussed later. Next, we shall analyze the structure of races and tribes of Spartacus’ Army. Races or tribes which joined Spartacus’ Army were Germans ⁽⁶⁴⁾, Gauls (Celts) ⁽⁶⁵⁾, Thracians ⁽⁶⁶⁾, Italians ⁽⁶⁷⁾, etc.

The Structure of Races and Tribes

(a) Germans

Germans were made to become slaves in a large quantity at the time when about 150,000 Cimbri and Teutoni were captured by Marius ⁽⁶⁸⁾. Since then, almost thirty years had passed by the time of Spartacus’ Uprising, but there must have been a few survivors living still. As battles between Romans and Germans were fought continuously ⁽⁶⁹⁾, captives must have been turned to slaves at each time. Besides these slaves out of battle fields, there must have been large numbers of Germans sold as slaves to Roma by slave traders since the middle of the second century B.C. ⁽⁷⁰⁾. Among them, there were many who became gladiators later ⁽⁷¹⁾. After Spartacus’ Uprising, when Caesar was fighting a desperate fight with Germans at Gallia, he encouraged his men reminding them of the event that Roman Army had defeated Spartacus’ Army formed of German slaves ⁽⁷²⁾. By this, we can guess Spartacus’ Army was taken together with Germans ⁽⁷³⁾. It sug-

gests that there were many Germanic slaves in Roma, and they were not a few in Spartacus' Army.

(b) Celts (Gauls)

Since Gallia Narbonensis was taken into a Roman province in 121 B.C., Roman power was gradually penetrating into Southern Gallia ⁽⁷⁴⁾, pacifying the uprisings by natives ⁽⁷⁵⁾. As the result, many Celtic slaves were brought to Roma. According to Sallustius, Celts-Germans occupied most part of Spartacus' Army ⁽⁷⁶⁾, and they had been sold to land owners and pasture owners around Campania and Southern Italia ⁽⁷⁷⁾. But when we refer the slaves of Celts (Gauls), we should know the ones from Northern Alps and also from Southern part of Alps (Gallia Cisalpina) ⁽⁷⁸⁾. Yet, the percentage of each is not known.

(c) Thracians

Since 104 B.C. ⁽⁷⁹⁾, various tribes of Thracian fought continuously with Roma - in 92 B.C. ⁽⁸⁰⁾, 90 B.C. ⁽⁸¹⁾, 89 B.C. ⁽⁸²⁾, 87-86 B.C. ⁽⁸³⁾, 77-76 B.C. ⁽⁸⁴⁾, and 75 B.C. ⁽⁸⁵⁾. They are said to have fought with Roma till the last tribe was conquered ⁽⁸⁶⁾. Therefore many slaves should be brought to Roma. Spartacus himself was one of them.

(d) Italians

It is almost clear that Italians participated in the uprising, for Mithridates knew the fact ⁽⁸⁷⁾, and Thesmistius mentioned Italians joined the uprising expecting to change the social situation ⁽⁸⁸⁾. Italian cities were not satisfied with Roman rule, and alienated from Roma at the time of Hannibal's invasion ⁽⁸⁹⁾. At the time of Italian Social War of 90 B.C., Italian Allied Cities were struggling to secure roman citizenship and liberated slaves to organize an army ⁽⁹⁰⁾. Since defeat of the Social War, Italians such as Samnium and Lucania were most radical and hostile toward Roma ⁽⁹¹⁾. Moreover, as mentioned before, many people lost their land under the difficult conditions of living and turned to *proletarii*. So, Italian participants for the uprising mean those declined poor peasants and riff-raff.

(e) Others

Many slaves must be brought from Greece, Syria, Asia Minor, Northern West Africa, Espania, etc. by being conquered or purchased ⁽⁹²⁾. Though the participation of slaves in the uprising from these countries may be probable, no historical material tells us about it. It may be possible that they might not participate the uprising for the following two reasons: firstly, after the subjugation of pirates in 102 B.C., the import of slaves from the East decreased, and their number decreased among Roman slaves ⁽⁹³⁾, secondly, these slaves from Greece and the East were not much used for agriculture nor pasturing, but employed either house-hold slaves or making bricks, bronze, glasses,

etc.⁽⁹⁴⁾. Anyway both Italians and the slaves from Greece and the East did not play important roles in the process of uprising and seemed not to have strong power in Spartacus' Army⁽⁹⁵⁾.

By this analysis of racial and tribal structure of Spartacus' Army, German-Celt were indicated to be the majority of Spartacus' Army. But it cannot be the definite answer to the second opinion. Therefore, analyses of social status, and of races and tribes are not yet sufficient for the justification of these three opinions on the cause of discord and disunity in Spartacus' Army. However, it is true enough that the analyses of social status as well as races and tribes are very significant basis in studying these subjects. Taking both of them synthetically, we might be able to approach to the core of the problem. Then, let us examine each of those opinions upon the basis of the analyses above.

At first let us examine the second opinion which takes the cause of discord and disunity as racial and tribal conflicts. This opinion draw a conclusion on the basis that the units by Crixos, Cannicus and Castus which separated from the main force of Spartacus' Uprising, were all formed of Celts (Gauls)-Germans⁽⁹⁶⁾, and the conflicts between Thracians or Greeks and Celts-Germans led the dissolution of the Army. If this racial and tribal conflicts should have been the definite cause, then all the Celts-Germans must have dropped out of Spartacus' Army when Crixos separated at the time of their marching toward Northern Alps from Southern Italia. The plan of marching up to North was aiming at going back to each of their home lands⁽⁹⁷⁾ ... some of them would go back to Thracia, and some to Gallia, crossing Alps. This plan would have been supported by both Thracians and Celts-Germans as long as they wished their liberation along this course. As this plan itself was aiming at marching upward to the North nearer to home lands of Celts-Germans, it would be unreasonable to think that only Celts-Germans stayed in Southern Italia while Thracians alone marched up to North crossing Alps⁽⁹⁸⁾. Moreover, as we made an analysis before, Celts-Germans occupied the majority of Spartacus' Army. So, even after the separation of Crixos, the majority of the army of marching-to-North was consisted still chiefly of Celts-Germans. And they returned to South having Celts-Germans as their main force. When Spartacus made a dash with his army through the lines of the besieging Roman force in Bruttium and pushed on to Brundisium, there happened separation of the units Cannicus and Castus whose members chiefly of Celts-Gemans. This confirms the facts that there were lots of Celts-Germans in the main force of marching-up-down units.

The separation of Celt-German forces led by Cannicus and Castus, at the last stage of their uprising, i.e., on the time of pushed on to

Brundisium, must have hastened the destruction of Spartacus' Army. But there is no positive proof that it was originated from the racial and tribal conflicts between Thracians and Celts-Germans. Besides, when the separation force were attacked by Roman Army, Spartacus tried to rescue them ⁽⁹⁹⁾. After separation units were destroyed, Spartacus' main force defeated pursuing Roman Army. Then, disagreements seemed to come up to front in the slave army. Yet, there is no instance of racial and tribal conflicts in the cause of this disagreements ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. Even if we admit the racial and tribal conflict there, we have to approve that there still remained Celt-German units in Spartacus' main force even after Celts-Germans departed for the racial conflict. This means the racial and tribal conflicts cannot be the fatal factor for the discord in Spartacus' Army. The difference of races and tribes (i.e. difference of languages, customs, habits) must have been quite a lot of arguments and squabbles in Spartacus' camps. But it didn't make a definite factor for the discord. As I discussed already, agriculture slaves, the nucleus of Spartacus' Army in quantity as well as quality, had been getting over the difference of races and tribes in their collective labours, it must be going on better during the battle with Roman Army and would secure the racial and tribal conflicts cannot be the fatal problem in the army. Even if Heitland, Ollivier and Vogt claimed Spartacus' Army as consisted of racial and tribal units, the majority of Spartacus' Army were Celts and Germans. Therefore, it is almost impossible to think that racial and tribal conflicts would be the fatal factor for the discord and disunity, when we take account of the fact that they separated twice and reached the final discord on the basis that they were mostly Celts-Germans either in the mainforces or in the separated. At the time of the first and the second Sicilian Slave Uprising, Roman rulers expected a discord between Syrians and Cilicians, and believed as "There were high hopes everywhere that the revolutionary groups would come into conflict one with the other, and that the rebels, by destroying themselves, would free Sicilia of strife", but the situation went the opposite way, and "contrary to expectations the two groups joined forces ⁽¹⁰¹⁾" and slave army kept on its unity. There was in the midst of an uprising, a basic class conflict between slave owners and slaves, racial and tribal conflicts in general had to retreat behind. So could be the case of Spartacus Uprising.

Now we reach to refer to Celtic-Germanic structure of Spartacus' Army here, in another word, the problem of the structure of "primitive community ⁽¹⁰²⁾". Firstly, Spartacus ordered his men to share the booty equally ⁽¹⁰³⁾ and not to possess any gold or silver privately in the camp ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. As for the matter of sharing, there is no distinct description

either in Caesar nor in Tacitus. But Cicero tells us the equality of the share among the more primitive races ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. The equality of the share have to be taken as a revival of an idea of primitive community ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. Spartacus ordered that nobody should possess gold or silver privately, as it should be the common property to everybody. This order might be issued partly from the fear of "*ne qua oriatur pecuniae cupiditas, qua ex re factiones dissensiones que nascuntur*" ⁽¹⁰⁷⁾, partly from indifference of Germans to gold or silver ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. But chiefly it would be issued for such people as Greek slaves and other wage labourers, small lessees, and *proletarii* who had been baptized with money economy, in order to avoid the extravagant trend to be brought into the camp with private ownership of gold and silver ⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. And this order of Spartacus must be supported by majority and be carried into effect. This fact indicates the great majority of Spartacus' Army was consisted of such primitive community members as Celts-Germans or Thracians ⁽¹¹⁰⁾.

Secondly, there was very little religious hue in Spartacus' Uprising. As we know, in the First Sicilian Slave Uprising, its leader Eunus was a prophet-magician, and his prophecy and miracles played a great role in uniting slaves ⁽¹¹¹⁾. And also in the Second Sicilian Slave Uprising, the leaders Salvius and Athenion prophesied fortune by animal intestines or by astrology ⁽¹¹²⁾. But, religion did not play any important part in Spartacus' Uprising. Indeed we find a female prophet and a sacrifice offering maiden in historical materials. But they could not make any positive contributions to unifying or organizing the slaves, and to their uprisings. It must be more articulate to say that religious ideology didn't play any definite role in Spartacus' Uprising ⁽¹¹³⁾. This leads us to think that Celts-Germans and Thracians as nucleus of the Army, had very primitive religion, which was combined with their community ideology and inseparable from it ⁽¹¹⁴⁾. Moreover, there was no common religion powerful enough to unify all the races ⁽¹¹⁵⁾.

Thirdly, it is difficult to understand the leadership in Spartacus' Army without taking military conferences or council meetings into account. Their first leaders, Spartacus, Crixos and Oenomaus didn't make themselves into leaders, but they were elected to be leaders ⁽¹¹⁶⁾. In case of war, leaders were usually elected in German or in Gaul community in those day. In German community, "*Cum bellum civitas aut illatum defendit aut infert, magistratus, qui ei bello praesint, ut vitae ne eis que habeant potestatem deliguntur. ... Atque ubi quis ex principibus in concilio dixit se ducem fore, qui sequi velint, profiteantur, consurgunt ei qui et causam et hominem probant suumque auxilium pollicentur atque ab multiudine collaudantur:*" (underlined by author)

In this way, war leaders were elected ⁽¹¹⁷⁾. In Gaul community also, a man of military experience and knowledge would be elected or sometimes be voted at a conference ⁽¹¹⁸⁾. Therefore, in Spartacus' Army also, when they say 'leaders were elected,' it means, they must have been 'elected at a meeting - military conference.' Sallustius tells us that in determining their strategy, they held conference to argue and to discuss ⁽¹¹⁹⁾. And Spartacus took a step of having a conference where he prohibited slaves from doing deviate actions of violence and plunder. By these, we can assume the existence of the conferences or meetings at which they debated and dealt with each problem. In fact, in German-Celt (Gaul) community also, as soon as any trouble would be aroused, they held conference to solve the problem ⁽¹²⁰⁾. The existence of conference could be assumed in this way, through this system slave leaders had been controled by slave mass and couldn't help but respect those slaves' will. It was the role of slave leaders ⁽¹²¹⁾ to achieve the will of the slaves most effectively and exactly. As Most, Mommsen and Motus indicated, if Spartacus' Army "lacked its solid plans and purposes," and if there were agitations in Spartacus, so could be the one among slave mass. For instance, Spartacus' Army started on their way to North over the Alps, under the plan of leaving Italia to their home lands... But, after defeating Roman Army seriously at Mutina, the Alpine front, they did not advance on to the Alps but went down to the South ⁽¹²²⁾. On that occasion, there must have been many discussions about the plan whether to cross the Alps or to go down at the soldiers' meeting and finally decided to take the latter plan by the majority. And it is also stated that after Cannicus' separation unit was destroyed, Spartacus encountered the pursuing Roman Army and defeated them. At that time, although Spartacus himself had plan of advancing to Brundidium, "This success was the ruin of Spartacus, for it filled his slaves with overconfidence. They would no longer consent to avoid battle, and would not even obey their leaders, but surrounded them as soon as they began to march, with arms in their hands, and forced them to lead back through Lucania against the Romans, ..." ⁽¹²³⁾. This suggests the fact that the will of slave mass could control the leaders. From these facts we could suppose that there was the military conference or council meetings in Spartacus' Army as well as in German-Celt community. In more general way, it could be said that the system of popular meeting of the primitive community would be inherited here.

The reason that Celtic-Germanic structure - primitive community structure of Spartacus' Army was discussed, is as the followings: firstly, as Celtic-Germanic elements were superior in Spartacus' Army and Thracians had also much of the elements of primitive community, de-

mocratic discussion should have been guaranteed at their military conferences. Therefore, the consideration above would affect negatively on the opinion which takes the cause of discord as racial conflicts. And secondly, that is a preparation to deny the opinion which would take the cause of discord as the contradiction between the slave leaders and the slave mass.

As for the first opinion which takes the cause of discord and disunity in conflicts between leaders and slave mass, the opinion has its characteristic in thinking Spartacus as a hero and genius who planned to get out of Italia to liberate slaves... and slaves were, instead, very contemptible and chose the course of revenge and plunder. As in historical materials, Spartacus must have been indeed a superb person ⁽¹²⁴⁾ and excelled in military strategic skill ⁽¹²⁵⁾. But we should also notice these ancient writers' hero worship for Spartacus had to be combined together with their feeling of shame and humiliation, because, leading those contemptible slaves, Spartacus defeated their "Unconquerable" Roman Army again and again. Most candid descriptions are found in Florus' ^(125a).

"Enimuero et servilium armorum dedecus feras; nam esti per fortunam in omnia obnoxii, tamen quasi secundum hominum genus sunt et in bona libertatis nostrae adoptatur: bellum Spartaco duce concitatum quo nomine appellem nescio: quippe cum servi militaverint, gladiatores imperaverint, illi infimae sortis homines, hi pessumae auxere ludibriis calamitatem Romanam ... a quo pulsi fugatique — pudet dicere — hostes in extrema Italiae refugerunt ... Spartacus ispe in primo agmine fortissime dimicans quasi imperator occisus est."

As we notice in Florus, he thought the slave uprising as very shameful (*pudor*), but on the other hand, he detached Spartacus alone from other slave mass and placed him in the same rank as Roman *imperator*. Making Spartacus worshipful hero in this way, and placing on a seat opposite to the slave mass, he honoured the Romans that they were defeated by hero Spartacus, not by the hands of those contemptible slaves. This Florus' description shows us the self-solacing sentiment of Romans for the damage done by Spartacus' Army. Modern bourgeois historians took such self-consciousness of the ancient Roma at its face value and thought seriously over the superiority of Spartacus over other slaves. Some of them create the probability of Spartacus as of Thracian nobles ⁽¹²⁶⁾. But the relation between leaders and slave mass was the similar one in the primitive community, i.e., slaves could control their leaders by means of their meeting ⁽¹²⁷⁾. There might have arisen some petty difference in their opinions, and sometimes there might have been occasions in which leaders restrained slaves, but these matters could

have been compromised by discussing out at the meetings. Therefore it would be improbable that the conflicts between leaders and slaves would be a most fatal factor for the discord and disunity. What made Spartacus a hero was not only by his superior ability, but also by his sacrifice of himself in fighting to liberate slaves, holding all the hopes and dreams of slaves on his back. In this sense, Motus is right in pointing out, "It is impossible to differentiate Spartacus from slave mass who motivated him to advance... Weak points and strong power of Spartacus indicate the exact capability of slave mass ⁽¹²⁸⁾ ."

From the view above, it would be hard to agree with the opinion which admits the existence of conflicts at the time when Spartacus chose the way to get out of Italia to liberate slaves, they wanted plunder and revenge, instead. As mentioned above, the plan of getting out of Italia was not a private plan of Spartacus, but it was representing the slaves hope. As for plundering, it is a well-known fact that when slaves plundered, revenged and acted very brutally, Spartacus prohibited them from those senseless deviate destructive conduct of slaves ⁽¹²⁹⁾ . But, the plundering itself was one of the most important supplies for Spartacus' Army, and was indispensable for supporting their combatants. In order for the forces to keep on living, they couldn't be negligent about it ⁽¹³⁰⁾ . As long as they were fighting in their enemy's land, this was inevitable and very natural. So, Hannibal's army had done the same when they invaded Italia ⁽¹³¹⁾ ; and by the view of Celts-Germans who were the majority of slave army, "*Latrocinia nullam habent infamiam, quae extra fines cuiusque civitatis fiunt* ⁽¹³²⁾ ." As long as the pludering brought common profits to slave army, it must have been approved by Spartacus also. Therefore, there couldn't have been basic conflict between Spartacus and slaves about plundering. To comment the conflicts between leaders and slaves here should be a clever and selfish substitution of their words for themselves. And as the slave uprising itself was the resistance against those unspeakable, inhuman treatment by slave owners, it was very natural that slaves had strong animosity against slave owners, wanted to revenge them, and acted violently toward them by those direct actions ⁽¹³³⁾ .

If these actions like plunder and revenge were blamed by slave owners as "horribly brutal", if Mommsen, a modern bourgeois historian, regards them as acts of "Räuber ⁽¹³⁴⁾ ", and if Ihne charges slaves as "..... sie in barbarischer Weise raubten und entsetzliche Frevel verübten", these are nothing but impudent, shameless words, ignorant to their own conduct. Slaves would better submit themselves boldly to those insults. As F. Engels says, we should like to tell them, "alle Moralpredigt machtlos bleibt ⁽¹³⁵⁾ ". Actually, the opponent of the slave army —

Roma itself — was regarding the plundering and destruction as their rights in the war ⁽¹³⁶⁾, and as not the one against the laws of Nature ⁽¹³⁷⁾. Wherever Roman Army went on expedition, there followed plunder and destruction ⁽¹³⁸⁾, and “brutal” violence toward females and other non-combatants, too ⁽¹³⁹⁾. In the process of establishing such a large Empire, by plunder or violence during the conquering wars or civil wars, it is said that “*turba sepulta mero circum venit, omniaque orbis/præmia corruptis miles vagus esurit armis*” ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾. As for those Roman slave owners and modern bourgeois historians who agree with them blindly... how could they have rights to blame the actions of the slave mass?

The problem is found further. For instance, when Lucullus was fighting with Mithridates, by necessity by his maneuvers he requested his Roman soldiers to stop plundering for a while. But looking at precious silver, gold and expensive clothes, soldiers ignored the order and kept on plundering ⁽¹⁴¹⁾. On the other hand, “brutal” violence by the slave mass in Spartacus’ Uprising was only committed at the beginning of the uprising. They took the step of self-restriction at their military regulation conference. Since then, they acted strictly against private possession of silver and gold ⁽¹⁴²⁾.

Even Plinius of Roman ruling class couldn’t help but praise them as “*tanto plus fuit animi fugitivis nostris*”. In the struggles of the oppressed against the ruling class, such a case as the oppressed fought with strict self restraining regulations is found not only in Spartacus’ Army, but also in Chinese peasant war ⁽¹⁴³⁾. And this was only possible because theirs were spontaneous armies by which the oppressed class was trying to liberate themselves from the exploitation and suppression. Self-restriction from violence and destruction could have been achieved by these military regulations, but as mentioned before, plunder and requisition out of slave owners were of necessity for the existence of slave army and Spartacus must have approved of plunder and requisition by slaves thus far, except the cases of doing senseless destruction. If we think this way, basically there couldn’t have been any discord and disagreements on this point between slave leaders and slaves... therefore, the conflicts between the leaders and the slaves couldn’t be fatal for their discord and disunity.

Next, let us turn to examine the third opinion which takes the cause of discord and disunity as the difference of maneuver plans between peasants and slaves. In order to validate this opinion, peasants and *proletarii* should have had joined Spartacus’ Army in large number. But by the analysis of social status in Spartacus’ Army, the main force was mostly formed of slaves. So, if wage labourers, small lessees and

proletarii had joined Spartacus' Army, their number had been very little and they couldn't have played any important roles. As mentioned several, the majority of Spartacus' Army was Celts-Germans, who were slaves. When we synthesize these analyses of social status, and of races and tribes, the free peasants in Spartacus' Army were very small in quantity as well as in quality ^(143a). On this point, we find a serious fault in Mischulin's opinion. Thinking the separation units of Crixos, Castus and Cannicus were formed of peasants ⁽¹⁴⁴⁾, he examined the names of Crixos and others and prove them as not Celt-Germanic ⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. But even if his investigation was right, the separation units were definitely proved by the other soviet historians to be Celts-Germans ⁽¹⁴⁶⁾. If peasants had participated in the separation units, they must have been a few in number and they could hardly move general trend in the units.

Moreover, Mischulin tries to compare the course of slave liberation with the course of peasants, which include the march into Roma, plunder (confiscation of wealth), expel of large land owners, and secure of the expelled land ⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. But as I have pointed out before, among these items plundering was not done by peasants alone, but done by the will of slaves in general, for it was necessary for the Army to survive. So, we have to remove plunder from the course of peasants. Yet, as for other items, such as march into Roma, expel large land owners, and confiscate land... Could these be fighting aims for peasants? The peasants who had participated in the uprising were wage labourers, small lessees, and *proletarii* who had lost their land. So it is would be probable that they had aims of secure land... that means the latter two items in so-called peasants' course. Yet, as for the item of marching into Roma, it is difficult to connect this with peasants' claims. If marching into Roma was proposed, it would be more possible for the slaves ⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ who had hated Roma as unadmissible and unfamiliar to have done it. If so, examining the structure of Spartacus' Army, or the items of the two courses, such an attractive opinion of Mischulin turns to be an unacceptable opinion.

Although unacceptable, Mischulin's opinion presented a very important theoretical problem in understanding the class struggle of the ancient slavery society. That is of the possibility of the joint conflict with the slave and declining free peasants under such historical conditions of those days. Mischulin took the conflicts of slaves versus peasants as a cause of discord in Spartacus' Army. It suggests on the other side, that he believed the possibility of alliance between slaves and peasants. In another word he thought there could be a conflict against Roma, slavery society; and that the leader of the conflict should be the

slaves, the fundamental class of the oppressed, and they would ally with the small peasants who were becoming radical under the agricultural crisis ⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. Taking Spartacus' Uprising as one of them, he thought there were many peasants participated in the uprising, but as the claims of slaves and peasants differed, there resulted to separation. This opinion of Mischulin's was resembled to the one of Kovalev's at his earlier age. But later, he criticized Mischulin's as it ignored the fact of ruptured relation between the free men and slaves ⁽¹⁵⁰⁾. S. L. Uttschenko also pointed out that the problem was not about peasants who joined the army in large number and brought the discord within. He indicated that there was no condition under which slaves and peasants could organize joint forces of slaves and peasants ⁽¹⁵¹⁾.

Not only these Soviet historians, but also there are many opinions of criticism on the idea of the joint force, for the breach between slaves and peasants were too big to join together ⁽¹⁵²⁾. But if we would admit the breach between slaves and peasants theoretically, there would come up a problem of where we should find the basis for their participation to the uprising... because the participation of wage labourers, small lessess and *proletarii* were already proved to be true. Oliva says, though it is impossible to explain the separation in Spartacus' Army from the point of the existence of peasants, Uttschenko's criticism against Mischulin too categorical and too strict to explain the fact that there were a few free peasants in Spartacus' Army ⁽¹⁵³⁾. We must notice that though free, these peasants would be out-laws from the country, not the *proletarii* in the city. Working at *latifundium* as wage labourers, in the process of the work along with the slaves, they were closer to slaves in their everyday life and sentiment. M. Weber says as follows: "Allein diese freien Arbeiter, welche, zumal in der Erntezeit, zunächst unentbehrlich waren, schrumpften immer mehr an relative Bedeutung zusammen, weil ihre Haltung neben den massenhaften Sklaven gefährlich schien,... ⁽¹⁵⁴⁾". Therefore, those free peasants could participate in the slave uprising, yet the number of them was very small portion among the whole peasant. We should not generalize the relations between the leadership and alliance of slaves and peasants, but admit the facts that small numbers of outlaw farmers joined the uprising. From the consideration above, the conflicts between slaves and peasants was not fated for the discord and disunity in Spartacus' Army.

None of these three opinions could satisfy us. Now, we should look for the true cause for the discord.

- (1) Plutarch, *Crassus* 8; Florus II, 8; Livius XCV; Orosius V, 24, 1
- (2) Plutarch, *Crassus* 9
- (3) Plutarch, *Crassus* 11; Appianus, *B.C.I.*, 116

- (4) Florus II, 8
- (5) Livius XCV
- (6) Plutarch, *Crassus* 8
- (7) Plutarch, *Crassus* 11
- (8) Appianus, *B.C.I*, 116
- (9) Appianus, *B.C.I*, 117
- (10) Appianus, *B.C.I*, 117
- (10a) In historical materials, numbers of gladiators when they escaped from gladiatorial training-school at Capua were varied, i.e.
Plutarch, *Crassus* 8 – 78; Sallustius, *Historiae* III., 90; Livius, *Ab urbe Condita* XCV; Frontinus, *Strategemata* I, 5, 21; Eutropius, *Brevium Historiae Romanae* VI, 7, 2; Orosius, *Historiae contra Paganos* V, 24, 1 – 74; Appianus *B.C.I*, 116 – 70; Augustinus, *De civitate Dei* III, 26 – less than 70; Velleius Paterculus, *Historiae Romanae* II, 30, 5 – 64; Cicero, *Ad Atticus* VI, 2, 8 – less than 50; Florus, *Epitome Bellorum Omnium Annorum DDC* II, 8 – more than 30.
- (11) Florus II, 8; Eutropius VI, 7, 2; Appianus, *B.C.I*, 116; Orosius V, 24, 1; etc.
- (12) Neumann S.62; Pareti III p.687; Ollivier pp.56-58; Mischulin SS.30–31; M. Grant, *Gladiatores*, New York, 1968, pp.9-13; Maria T. Sergejenko; *Pompeji*, Leibzig, 1954, p.p.223-245; etc.
- (13) Plutarch, *C. Gracchus* 33 (12); Seneca, *De Vitae Brevitate* 16; Petronius, *Satyricon* II, 45; J. K. Ingram, *A History of Slavery and Serfdom*, London 1895 (Japanese Translation) p.48; E.C.C.Corti, *Untergang und Aufstehung von Pompeji und Herculanum*, 1940, München (trans. by K. Matsutani, p.66
- (14) By Plutarch, *Sulla* 8, a tribune of Sulla's age, Sulpicius was keeping 3000 gladiators; and by Plutarch, *Caesar* 5, Caesar presented 320 pairs of fighting matches in a year of 65 B.C.; There are many other examples like this; By Kentaro Murakawa, *The Society based on slavery*, (*Shakaikagaku Koza* IV Tokyo) p.48, As a kind of luxury slaves, gladiators who had been kept by Roman wealthy men for show matches with real weapons reveal the examples of low morals among slavery society.
But it is more adequate to describe this as it is the proof of lowness of Roman ruling class, especially wealthy slave owners as Caesar and Sulla.
- (15) Cicero, *Ad Atticus* IV, 46, "*Medius fidius ne to emisti loxon praeclarum. Gladiatores audio pugnace mirifice. Si locare voluisses, duobus his muneribus liber esses.*" So, this means that even if gladiators were very expensive, they can collect the capital soon and still gain profit.
- (16) Neumann S. 62; Ollivier p.56
- (17) Bonghi p.11; Brisson pp.204-205
- (18) Bonghi p.9; Ollivier p.58; Gaius, *Institutiones* I, 13, 14, 15, 25, 26, also made clear that gladiators ranked at the bottom of slave classes.
- (19) Plutarch, *Moralia* III De esu Carnium
- (20) Oliva, *Sklavenaufstände* S. 78
- (21) Mahaffy, *The Slave Wars against Rome*, *Hermathena* XVI, 1890, p.176. He claims main body of slave uprising was gladiators and not labourers. But this is just inconceivable. M. Gordon, *The Nationality of Slaves under the Early Roman Empire*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 14, 1924, p.103, also points out that gladiators occupied only the minority of prisoners.
- (22) Varro, *Rerum Rusticarum* II, X, 11 says, for 50 horses, two horse keepers were needed; Horatius, *Sermonum* I, 4 also describes the horse keeping situations.
- (23) G. Salvioi, *Der Kapitalismus im Altertum*, 1922, (trans by C. Inoue) pp.72, 73, 102-103; Kentaro Murakawa, *Roman Latifundium*, pp.51-52 (*Shakai Koseishi Taikei* II, Tokyo, 1949)
- (24) Varro II, X, 3
- (25) K. Bücher, *Die Aufstände der unfreien Arbeiter* 143-129 V. Chr.

- (*Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 1922) S. 126
- (26) Bücher, S. 118, S. 144; Murakawa, *Roman Latifundium*, p.52; Salvioli, *Kapital*, pp.102-103
- (27) Most S.92
- (28) Plutarch, *Crassus* 9
- (29) By Florus II, 8, "*dometis obviis etiam gregibus paratur equitatus*." So, this must mean herdsmen joined Spartacus' Army, taking their horses with them. And as they were used to taking care of them, these herdsmen must have become cavalry men. Also in Appianus, *B. C.* I., 119, there is an expression, "Spartacus, who was expecting a reinforcement of horse from somewhere..." and again in 120, when they broke out the siege in Bruttium, "as his cavalry had arrived he made a dash with his whole army through the lines of the besieging force." So, evidently these cavalry men were fulfilling important roles in Spartacus' Army.
- (30) Ollivier pp.98-99
- (31) By Varro II, I, 17; II, II, 9, Varro himself owned a numerous flocks of sheep at Apulia region in Southern Italy, and every summer he had them moved to Reate and Samnium in Middle Italy to graze. So, these herdsmen must have been familiar with the geography along the course of moving sheep at least from Southern Italy to Middle Italy. And this knowledge of theirs must have been very useful for choosing their marching courses. M.Weber, *Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum*, S. 243 points out that "Grosse Weidewirtschaften mit Wanderherden sind in Apulien und in den «Calles» der Berglandschaften herrschend,". Murakawa, *Roman Latifundium*, p.48, also quotes Varro and explains about the migration of sheep flocks.
- (32) Since attacking Mt. Vesuvius, after several winning battles against Roman Army, slave army rapidly increased its number and according to Appianus, their number said to have reached 70,000. As for the situation at the time, see Doi, *Reconstructing Spartacus Servile War*, pp.58-64.
- (33) By Varro II, X, 11, one shepherd for every 80 sheep, and by Atticus, one for every 100 sheep were needed.
As for horses, as it was mentioned before, 2 herdsmen per 50 horses were considered to be adequate.
- (34) Varro I, II, 6; G. Salvioli, *Sulla distribuzione della proprietà fondiaria in Italia al tempo dell'Impero Romano*, Modena, 1899, pp.33-34
- (35) Plinius, N. H. XVIII, iv, 4, 5; VII, 4; Ingram, pp.41-42; As for *ergastulum*, see M. Weber, *Agrar*, SS. 243-244; M. Weber, *Die sozialen Gründe des Untergangs der antiken Kultur, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Tübingen, 1924, SS.297-298
- (36) Diodorus XXXVI, 2; T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, I p.293; M.Doï, A Note on the Second Sicilian Slave Revolt, *Hogaku Shirin* 1966, vol. 63, no.4, p.140
- (37) Salvioli, *distribuzione*, p. 34 says Spartacus recruited many slaves from *latifundium*; Weber, *Agrar*, S. 242 says the large scale of slave revolts reveal the rapidly increasing number of unfree farm labourers and their importance in the quantity.
- (38) Schtaerman, p.235; Kovalev, *Velli. vosst.*, p.178; Oliva, *Sklavenaufstände* S. 78; A. H. M. Jones, *Slavery in the Ancient World, The Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 9, 1956, p.192
- (39) Kovalev, *Velli. vosst.*, p.178
- (40) Schtaerman, p.245 says, slaves in the cities generally did not participate in the uprisings.
- (41) Gummerus, *Industrie und Handel*, R. E. S. 1487; Chiyu Inoue, *Studies in Economic History of Roma*, Tokyo, 1948, p.226
- (42) Inoue p.207
- (43) Noriaki Baba, *Roman Industry, Kodaishi Koza* 9, Tokyo, 1963, pp.84, 85; Inoue, p.186

- (44) Baba, p.95; Inoue, p.203
- (45) Baba, pp.84-85; Inoue, p.186
- (46) Ollivier, p.98 says Lucanian herdsmen made shields. They are said to be excelled in wicker handicraft.
- (47) Florus II, 8; Frontinus I, 7, 6; Appianus, *B. C. I*, 117
- (48) Diodorus V, 13; V, 223; T. Frank, *Economic History of Rome*, New York, 1952, p.233; Baba, p.9; Inoue, p.204; Shoji Tachikawa, Make of the ironware in Europe, *Rekishi Kyoiku*, March 1966, p.44; Mischulin, Spart. vosst. p. 118; Ward, p. 264 n. 75, p.265
- (49) G. Veith, *Die Zeit der Kohortentaktik*; trans. by Usaburo Tonoyama, Tokyo, 1944, p.28
- (50) Plutarch, *Crassus* 8
- (51) Plutarch, *Crassus* 11
- (52) Tacitus, *Germania* I, 8
- (53) Above Tacitus, *Germania* I, 8 has the example also.
- (54) Murakawa, Roman Latifundium, pp.70-71; Mischulin, Spartacus, S. 66 says small lessees were sympathetic to the uprising. Oliva, *Sklavenaufstände*, S. 79 without relating to small land owners or small lessees, he points out the participation of poor peasants. Weber, *Agrar*, S. 246 without relating to their participation in the uprising, he points out the increasing numbers of small lessees.
- (55) By Oliva, *Sklavenaufstände* S.79, J. Burian, *Eleutheroi ek tón agrón a povstani Spartakovo*, *LF*, V, SS.197-203 proved "Free men from the fields" in Appianus means wage labourers. As for wage labourers see Cato, *De Agricultura* 136; Varro, I, XVII, 2; Salvioli, *Kapital*, p.104; Pareti III, p.690, etc.
Weber S.244 says in the beginning these labourers were indispensable at harvest time, but later they lost their relative significance, because it was thought to be dangerous to employ free labourers along with many slaves. The above fact and Varro's advice to change the members of free labourers every day, suggest the participation of wage laborers. See Jones p.193
- (56) Sallustius III, 98; Pareti III p.690
- (57) Murakawa, Roman Latifundium, p.11
- (58) Doi, *Reconstructing Spartacus Servile War*, pp.53-54, By their labour structure. it is naturally assumable that the numbers of wage labourers were much more than that of small lessees among "free men from the fields."
- (59) Doi, *ibid*, p.69, note 43
- (60) Appianus, *B. C. I*, 117
- (61) W. Ihne, *Römische Geschichte*, 1886, VI S.48; Heitland III p.2; Salvioli, *Kapital*, pp.70, 86-87; Pareti III p.69; T. Frank, *Economic Survey* I, pp.279-280
- (62) Tadanori Yoshimura, *An History of Roman Army*, *Sekai no Senshi*, III Tokyo, 1966, p.411; Diesner S.154
- (63) Appianus, *B.C. I*, 117
- (64) Plutarch, *Crassus* 9; Livius XCVII; Sallustius III, 87, 96
- (65) Livius XCVII, Sallustius III, 96; Orosius V, 24,1; Plutarch, *Crassus* 8
- (66) Plutarch, *Crassus* 8; Orosius V, 24, 1; Appianus, *B. C. I*, 116
- (67) Appianus, *Mithridates* 109
- (68) Livius LXVIII; Plutarch, *Marius* 21, 27; B. Doer, *Spartacus, Das Altertum* 6, 1960, S.222
- (69) Tacitus, *Germania* II, 37 says, "*sescentesimum et quadragesimum annum urbs nostra agebat, cum primum Cimbrorum audita sunt arma Caecilio Mettello et Papirio Carbone consulibus. ex quo si ad alterum imperatoris Traiani consulatum Computemus, ducenti ferme et decem anni colliguntur: tam diu Germania vincitur. medio tam longi aevi spatio multa in vicem damna. non Samnis, non Poeni, non Hispaniae Galliaeve, ne Parthi auidem*"

- saepius admonuere: quippe regno Arsacis acrior est Germanorum libertas.*" (underlined by author) By this, we can assume there were continuous battles. It was also reported that a big revolt by Germans was broken out at Köln 20 years after the foundatiok of Colonia for retired Roman soldiers. (69 B.C.) T. Yuge, *State and Society of Roman Empire*, Tokyo, 1964, p.23
- (70) E. A. Thompson, Slavery in Early Germany, *Hermathena* no.89, 1957, p.18, pp.20-21
 - (71) Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire*, Oxford, 1923, I, pp.156-157; Also by Plutarch, *Crassus* 8, most gladiators in Batiatus Gladiator Training School at Capua were Thracians and Gauls.
 - (72) Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* I, 40
 - (73) Antonio Gramsci, Appunti sulla storia delle classi subalterne (*Il Risorgimento*, Torino, 1955) p.196 regards the core of Spartacus' Army as formed of Cimbri slaves.
 - (74) Cicero, *De Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 11, 30 (77 B.C.); Sallustius II, 98 (75 B.C.)
 - (75) Livius LXXIII (89 B.C.)
 - (76) Sallustius III, 96; Doer SS.224-225 also assumes the majority of the army as German-Celts slaves.
 - (77) Varro II, X, 4 says Gauls (Celts) were suitable for herdsmen. T. Frank, *Economic Survey* p.291
 - (78) Salvioli, Kapital, pp.82-83; Gordon, p.100, p.102
 - (79) Obsequens 43
 - (80) Livius LXX
 - (81) Livius LXXIV
 - (82) Livius LXXVI
 - (83) Livius LXXXI; Plutarch, *Sulla* 11, 15, 23
 - (84) Livius XCI; Florus I, 31, 6; Eutropius VI, 2,2; Orosius V, 23, 19; Obsequens 59
 - (85) Livius XCII; Sallustius II, 80; Eutropius VI, 2,2; Orosius V, 23, 20
 - (86) Strabo VI, 4, 2
 - (87) Appianus, *Mithridates* 109
 - (88) Themistius, *Orat.* VII; Mischulin, Spartacus, S.67
 - (89) For instance, Plutarch, *Fabius* 17; *Marcellus* 10, etc. See Ollivier p.142, p.72, pp.78-79, p.90, p.140; Salvioli, Kapital, pp.67-68
 - (90) Appianus, *B. C.* I, 42; Diodorus XXXVII; Schtaerman, p.225
 - (91) Plutarch, *Sulla* 29; Ollivier p.79, p.140
 - (92) Gordon pp.94-96; Ingram, p.35
 - (93) Egon Maróti, Die Rolle der Seeräuberei zur Zeit der römischen Bürgerkriege, *Das Altertum* Bd. 7, Heft 1, 1961, S.34
 - (94) Gummerus R. E. S. 1498, 1499, 1504, 1509; Inoue, pp.236-237
 - (95) Vogt S.26
 - (96) Plutarch, *Crassus* 9; Sallustius III, 96; Frontinus II, 4, 7; Livius XCVII; Orosius V, 24, 1:V, 24, 6
 - (97) Plutarch, *Crassus* 9
 - (98) Mischulin, Poslednii pohod Spartaka i ego gibeli, *PIDO*, 1935 no.7-8, p.121
 - (99) Plutarch, *Crassus* 11
 - (100) Plutarch, *Crassus* 11; Here, the point of dispute was whether they would fight with Roman Army or march toward Brundisium.
 - (101) Diodorus, XXXIV-XXXV, 2, 17; Mischulin, Spartacus, SS.69-71; This quotation is from the time of the First Slave Uprising, but the similar incident was found in the Seconde Slave Uprising, too. M.Doi, Problems about the First Sicilian Slave Revolt, *Hogaku Shirin*, 1965, vol. 62, no. 3-4, p.41; Doi, A Note on the Seconde Sicilian Slave Revolt p.146
 - (102) I would like to add some explanations about this structure of "primitive community. "As for the issues on Germanic community, since K. Marx, "*Formen, Die der kapitalischen Produktion Vorhergehen*" (Berlin, 1952) was translated into Japanese, lots of arguments have been presented in our

academic circles. In Formen, SS.16-18, Germanic structure of the community is explained as follows:

“Bei den Germanen, wo die einzelnen Familienhäupter sich in Wäldern festsetzen, getrennt durch lange Strecker, existiert, schon äusserlich betrachtet, die Gemeinde nur durch die jedes malige Vereinigung der Gemeindeglieder, obgleich ihr an sich seiende Einheit gesetzt ist in Abstammung, Sprache, gemeinsamer Vergangenheit und Geschichte etc. Die Gemeinde erscheint also als Vereinigung, nicht als Verein, als Einigung, deren selbständige Subjekte die Landeigentümer bilden, nicht als Einheit. Die Gemeinde existiert daher in fact nicht als Staat, Staatswesen, wie bei den Antiken, weil sie nicht als Stadt existiert. Damit die Gemeinde in wirkliche Existenz trete, müssen die freien Landeigentümer Versammlung halten, Zwar kommt auch bei den Germanen der ager publicus, das Gemeindeland, vor oder Volksland, im Unterschied von dem Eigentum des einzelnen. Er ist Jagdgrund, Weidegrund, Holzungsgrund etc..... Der ager publicus erscheint vielmehr nur als Ergänzung des individuellen Eigentums bei den Germanen und Figuriert als Eigentum nur, soweit er gegen feindliche Stämme als Gemeinbesitz des einen Stammes verfochten wird. Das Eigentum des einzelnen erscheint nicht vermittelt durch die Gemeinde, sondern das Dasein der Gemeinde und des Gemeindeeigentums als vermittelt, d.h. als Beziehung der selbständigen Subjekte aufeinander... In der germanischen Form der Landmann nicht Staatsbürger, d.h. nicht Städtebewohner, sondern Grundlage die isolierte, selbständige Familienwohnung, garantiert durch den Verband mit andren solchen Familienwohnungen vom selben Stamm und ihr gelegentliches, für Krieg, Religion, Rechtsschlichtung, etc., Zusammenkommen für solche wechselseitige Bürgschaft.”

Moreover, the following description of K. Marx, Entwurf Antwort auf den Brief von V. I. Sassulich, is often quoted as related to the Germanic community:

“Wenn wir nach der Epoche des Tacitus weder etwas vom Leben der Gemeinde noch von der Art und der Zeit ihres Verschwinden wissen, so kennen wir doch dank der Beschreibung Julius Cäsars wenigstens den Ausgangspunkt dieses Prozesses. Zu seiner Zeit wurde der Boden schon jährlich aufgeteilt, aber unter die Gentes und Stämme der germanischen – Stammesverbände und noch nicht unter die einzelnen Mitglieder einer Gemeinde. Die Dorfgemeinde ist also in Germanien aus einem archaischeren Typus hervorgegangen, sie war hier das Produkt einer natürlichen Entwicklung, und immer als der letzten Stufe oder letzten Periode der archaischen Formation.” (*Marx-Engels Werke* 19, Berlin, S.387) And moreover he pointed out as follows: “Die Urgemeinschaften sind nicht alle nachdem gleichen Muster zugeschnitten. Ihre Gesamtheit bildet im Gegenteil eine Reihe von gesellschaftlichen Gruppierungen, die sich sowohl im Typus wie im Alter voneinander unterscheiden und die aufeinanderfolgende Entwicklungsphasen kennzeichnen. Einer dieser Typen, den man übereingekommen ist “Ackerbaugemeinde” zu nennen, ist auch der der russischen Gemeinde. Ihr Gegenstück im Westen ist die germanische Gemeinde, die sehr jungen Datums ist. Zur Zeit Julius Cäsars existierte sie noch nicht, und sie existierte nicht mehr, als die germanischen Stämme Italien, Gallien, Spanien, etc. eroberten. In der Epoche Julius Cäsars gab es schon eine jährliche Aufteilung des Ackerlands unter Gruppen, den Gentes und den Stämmen, aber noch nicht unter die einzelnen Familien einer Gemeinde; wahrscheinlich erfolgte die Bebauung in Gruppen, gemeinschaftlich. Auf germanischen Boden selbst hat sich diese Gemeinschaft von archaischeren Typus durch eine natürliche Entwicklung zur Ackerbaugemeinde umgewandelt, so wie sie Tacitus beschrieben hat. Nach seiner Zeit verlieren wir sie aus den Augen Sie gingen in den unaufhörlichen Kriegen

und Wanderungen unbemerktzugrunde: sie endete vielleicht auf gewaltsame Weise." (*Marx-Engels Werke* 19, S. 402)

It is a well known fact that there are many arguments about Marx's concept of German community. Hisao Ohtsuka in his "*Basic Theory of Community*" (Tokyo, 1955) with "Formen" in mind, explains his unique theory that German community is a "feudalistic" community and not in the same category as that of Caesar's "*De Bello Gallico*" or Tacitus' "*Germania*." In his idea, the community of these Germanic tribes are not conceivable as Germanic formation of community, but it is more adequate to put this in the same category as Germanic "community" after Merovingian Frank (pp.81-83).

Regarding this, Hiroshi Fujiwara in his "What is Germanic Community?" (*Studies of English Economic History*, Tokyo, 1959) proved Ohtsuka's idea of German community as neither community described in "Formen" nor German agricultural community in Marx's letter to V.I. Saasulitbh.

Kimio Shiozawa is on the side of Ohtsuka, and studied Marx-Engel's idea of community and productive system in general in his "*The Structure of Ancient Monarchy*" (Tokyo, 1958) pp.3-42. He says, Fujiwara claims that when Marx wrote "Formen", Marx had not read the book of Maurer, so his idea of community must have been Early Germanic community in the form of scattered residence. But, to this idea of Fujiwara's, Shiozawa agrees only partially, and he contends that, at the time, Marx put Early German community in the same category as feudalistic form of a community, but as he realized later that Germanic community of Tacitus' period to be of Asian form, he revised his former idea in "The Letter to V.I. Sassulich." So by Shiozawa's opinion, community in "Formen" was described as similar to the feudalistic form, and by general concepts of the structure also, Germanic community in "Formen" should be put into the same category as feudalistic form of community. (pp.16-17)

Hidemichi Ohta studied this point in "*A Theory on Community and Heroic Age*," (Tokyo, 1959) and explains as follows:

In "Formen," Marx generalized the condition of the Germans described in Tacitus, but after he read Maurer, he revised his own opinion. He took the stage of Germans in Caesar as the form of periodical allotment among communities, the form of preagricultural community. And he took Germanic community in Tacitus as a kind of agricultural community, a new form of community after racial migration, in which members shared woods, livestock farming lands and wild fields, while they owned their cultivable land individually. As the result, he pulled down the stage of Germanic community in "Formen" to the stage of the new community form after racial migration. (p.21)

But, later, after farther development of the study and much more arguments, he realized as it was rather groundless to take this agricultural community as that of early Germanic, because, as a conclusion, this "new community" of Marx's originated and succeeded from very ancient times. So, in the end, the description in "Formen" coincided with the opinion of academic circles, resulted from much debates. (p.22)

The question here is the problem of German-Gaul society before the time of Caesar, so it is not directly related with the arguments on Germanic community. If agricultural community is not admissible, there still left the Marx's problem of conversion "vom Gerineigentum zu Privateigentum" and "von der primären zur sekundären Formation." And the stage before Caesar was recognized by Marx as "ein archaischer Typus," that is, closer to primitive community based on the natural blood relations of the members - sharing houses, producing cooperatively and outputs only were being distributed among them. Both Shiozawa and Ohta agree with him on this point. Shiozawa thinks community at Caesar's period as more ancient,

archaic community than Asiatic community. (pp.29-30)

Ohta also thinks Germanic community in "Formen" as secondary formation of abiogenetic tribes (p.22), but if members owned their property privately, they were not ruled by any other classes and had the formation of pre-class society. And the village community of the early Germans can be called as primitive community (not in the meaning of 'commonly shared') • (p.29) As Ohta thinks Germanic community in "Formen" as reflecting the status of Germans in Tacitus' period, the stage before Caesar should have to be more primitive. If we think this way, it is evident that German society in Spartacus' age was at the stage of pre-class society, namely, at the stage of primitive community.

But by the opinion of Shiro Masuda in his "Basic Structure of Ancient German Society" (*Studies in Early Feudal Society of Western Europe*, Tokyo, 1959) and "State and Economy of German Races", (Tokyo, 1951) he says:

"Those clear-cut opinions such as; German society in Caesar's and Tacitus' age was nomadic or semi-nomadic, or the Markgenossenschaft was the inherited system from primitive communism system, or originally Germans had free and equal social system... It is very hard to find these opinions any more even in the most conservative text book of legal history. Now, still more, it is very dangerous to explain the actual condition of German society from a mere outward resemblance of the phenomena in existing primitive society. (Basic Structure, p.26, underlined by author)

He adds: "Change of quality in German society during 150 years from Caesar to Tacitus, that is development from nomadic or semi-nomadic state to a settled agricultural society; or from the state without private rights for property to the society with the idea of privacy... This loose but attractive way of presenting problems has lost most of its significance already. And this rather proves the richness of archaeological harvests and ceaseless existence of agricultural society in these 150 years. (Basic Structure, p.44; State and Economy pp.6-7)

This opinion of Masuda's should not be taken as the criticism solely against researchers of 19th century Europe, but also should taken as against Marxism historians.

But even if we approve Masuda's claim of continuous existence of agricultural society for these 150 years, this doesn't lead up to lose the significance of "Formen" in which characteristics of German society were clarified. Even more, it is just inconceivable to claim that it is not significant to study about the problems of the transition from primitive community into class society. However, Masuda says; "significance of studying ancient German society today has become a much more different character than that of 18th or 19th century... It does not contribute to clarify general primitive stage in the world history any more. It has achieved the significance as a previous step in building up a special society of "Europe." (Basic Structure, p.26)"

By Masuda's interest in this problem, it is understandable that he should admit the significance in studying early German society as a previous step of only European Society. But is it really adequate to conclude as not contributing to clarify general primitive stage? As the result of his interest, Masuda has come to take the view as follows: When he takes up the problem of early Germanic society, he assumes Tacitus' "*Germania*" as incomparable with any other, and he was surprised to realize that there were hardly any description of directly approving the free and equal society, and on the contrary, there were many descriptions proving the inequality of their society. (Basic Structure, p.44) And he concludes the structure of early German society as ruled by aristocracy — ruled by pre-fuedal, abiogenetic powerful families. (Basic Structure, pp.75-76)

It is possible to acknowledge above class differentiation as Ohta says. "Taking German community as a starting point, by the spontaneous development of social rankings and subordinations within, this differentiation is a transition of free members of community turning into subjection to the lords, that is, this process of owning lands concentrically is nothing but a forming process of feudal society of Western Europe. In this process, needless to say but, patriarchal slave system developed in a certain degree as a *uklad*. This is a common phenomenon at a transition period of primitive community into class-society." (p.22) And then, another opinion as Masayoshi Miyoshi's is presented in "An Essay of the so-called Pre-Feudal Subjects in the Early Middle Age (*Zinbun Gakuho*, Kyoto XV, 1961)." By Miyoshi, German society in Tacitus' age was at the stage of transition "von der primären zur sekundären Formation." (Marx), but the restriction against the group members were still very strict. (p.18) In this age slaves were in pre-slavery system, and Germanic community was a patriarchal family community. (pp.16-17)

The question we are facing here is what kind of characteristics Germanic society had in Spartacus' day. Let us see Masuda's opinion about this problem. Is early German society by Masuda only representing the society described in Tacitus? Masuda thinks Tacitus as indispensable document for studying early German society because "even if the descriptions of Caesar's '*De Bello Gallico*' were based on his real experiences, (1) those descriptions were limited to some part of German tribes, and (2) as they were definitely proved by Hoops and Prof. Dopsch, they were evidently revealing the exceptional state legislation and economic system of wartime. And so, it is no exaggeration to say that there is no other documents which has more objective descriptions of ordinary, peacetime German society as a whole than those of Tacitus." (State and Economy, p.5; Basic Structure, p.44) And as he already has quoted, when he claims continual existence of agricultural society for 150 years from Caesar to Tacitus, he must be including Caesar period in early German society. If so, Germanic society in Caesar period should have been pre-feudal, abiogenetic and patriarchal, too. What does Masuda mean by this pre-feudal, abiogenetic and patriarchal? That is; either in the case of one headman system in "tribal agricultural society" (State and Economy p.45) or even in monarchic state, with some exceptions, this is not a fully developed "ruling state". Putting aside the adequacy of his above expression, its general outlook is "*Volkstaat*" itself. They were observing such ruling system as the tradition of sustaining people's conference as the core of volition of state under aristocrats' "pro-council traits." (State and Economy, p.90, underlined by author) This was not a territorial ruling, but it was forming a boundary of power on the base of personal relationship. (Basic Structure, p.75)

So far, Masuda has not proposed with any positive opposition against the opinion that German society was the prior to class-society. But, as he strongly opposes the idea of "primitive communism" and was too conscious of it that he says "it doesn't make sense to look for fundamentals of power in land ownership only and to think only about authority over people by medium of land." (Basic Structure, p.75) In this way, he tries to avoid the problem of community deliberately. As the result, though he stipulates it as ruled by pre-feudal abiogenetic powerful families, early German society — especially at the stage of Caesar — should be stipulated as pre-class-society... primitive community.

In discussing about the stage of Caesar in German society, attaching importance to Tacitus, Masuda still has to admit, "It is dangerous to think Caesar's value as historical material could be definitely dropped by this." (Basic Structure, p.51) So, the descriptions of Caesar as follows should be

recognized as very important: "*Sed privati ac separati agri apud los nihil est, neque longius anno remanere uno in loco incolendi causa licet.*" (*De Bello Gallico*, IV, 1) and, "*Agriculturae non student, maiorque pars eorum victus in lacte, caseo, carne consistit. Neque quisquam agri modum certum aut fines habet proprios; sed magistratus ac principes in annos singulos gentibus cognationibusque hominum, qui una coierunt, quantum et quo loco visum et agri attribuunt atque anno post alio transire cogunt. Eius rei multas adferunt: ne adsidua consuetudine capti studium belli gerendi agricultura commutent; ne latos fines parare studeant, potentioresque humiliores possessionibus expellant;*" (VI, 22)

Even if it is a peculiar example under wartime emergencies like Masuda claims; or if it should be branded as a kind of "state socialism" by Dopsch (*State and Economy*, p.7) ... This speculation of Dopsch is, how very similar to the idea of Vogt who defined the equality of the share among Spartacus' Army as "Kriegskommunismus"!); or if Caesar was describing the wartime emergencies in primitive community; attaching importance to primitive community traits in German society as in the description of Caesar, it should not be taken to slightly as Masuda says as "The development from nomadic or farming communistic society into unequal society of settled agriculture... this attractive way of presenting problems has already become a senseless discussion." (*State and Economy*, p.7)

It would be rather adequate to take it as Miyoshi defines:

"The collective utilization of land in "*De Bello Gallico*" was a situation in which the highest authority of the tribe established at wartime, controled the land utilization under their official rights. It must have been a kind of temporary revision of privacy rights (actually an individual land utilization) at wartime. Even in "*Germania*" in which peacetime situations were described, the above collective restraining power at wartime naturally should have been included (even if it was latent). It is more adequate to interpret this assumption as a premise that land proprietary was only possible with collective ownership of community." (p.18) The character like this of primitive community in German society is also found in Caesar VI, 23, and as E. A. Thompson is emphatically claiming in "Slavery in Early Germany," pp.17-24, it is corroborated as underdeveloped stage of slavery system in German society. For instance, in Tacitus' *Annales* XIII, 56, there is a description as follows: "*et ceteris quoque aliena pericula deserentibus sola Ampsivariorum gens retro ad Usipos et Tubantes concessit. Quorum terris exacti cum Chattos, dein Cheruscos petissent, errore longo hospites, egeni, hostes in alieno quod inventutis erat caeduntur, in bellis aetas in praedam divisa est.*" Thompson (p.22) assumes this as murder of the prisoners by Germanic peoples, and he thinks it as common practice among primitive people to kill adults, and to enslave women and children.

By the above, we recognize Germanic society as a structure prior to class-society... at a stage of primitive community. Then, how about Celt (Gaul) society? This too, we have nothing but "*De Bello Gallico*" to rely on. "*In omni Gallia eorum hominum, qui aliquo sunt numero atque honore, genera sunt duo. Nam plebes paene servorum habetur loco, quae nihil audet per se, nullo adhibetur consilio. Plerique cum aut aere alieno aut magnitudine tributorum aut iniuria potentiorum premuntur, sese in servitutem dicant nobilibus: in hos eadem omnia sunt iura, quae dominis in servos. Sed de his duobus generibus alterum est druidum, alterum equitum.*" (VI, 13) or, "*Quae civitates commodius suam rem publicam administrare existimantur, habent legibus sanctum, si quis quid de republica a finitimis rumore aut fama acceperit, uti ad magistratum deferat neve cum quo alio communicet,... De republica nisi per concilium loqui*

non conceditur." (VI, 20) or, "... legati ad eum principes Aeduorum veniunt oratum ut maxime necessario tempore civitati subveniat: Summo esse in periculo rem, quod, cum singuli magistratus antiquitus creari atque regiam potestatem annum obtinere consuessent, duo magistratum gerant et se uterque eorum legibus creatum esse dicat." (VII, 32) When we read these descriptions, even though it was a little developed than that of Germanic society, we can't help but recognize this Celtic society as still a structure of pre-class society ... a stage of primitive community in which a tradition of honoring people's conference kept alive with tribes as its core.

- (103) Appianus, *B. C. I*, 116
- (104) Appianus, *B. C. I*, 117; Plinius *N. H.* XXXIII, 49
- (105) Cicero, *De Officiis*, II, 40 "*Nam qui eorum cuiquam, qui una latrocinantur, furatur aliquid aut eripit, is sibi ne in latrocinio quidem relinquit locum, illi autem, qui archipirata dicitur, nisi aequabiliter praedam dispertiat, aut interficiatura sociis aut relinquatur; quin etiam leges latronum esse dicuntur, quibus pareant, quas observent. Itaque propter aequabilem praedae partitionem et Bardulis Illyrius latro, de quo est apud Theopompum, magnas opes habuit et multo maiores Viriathus Lusitanus: cui quidem etiam exercitus nostri imperatores que cesserunt;*" By this description, we can see in the countries where primitive community system was still existing as Illyria and Espania, they were still observing equal sharing.
- (106) Oliva, *Sklavenaufstände* S. 82 is assuming the rule of equality being observed among them. But, Mischulin, *Spartak* vosst. p.89; Mischulin, *Spartacus* S. 105 suggests that the communistic concept of Platon (Greek Utopia) was taken rather critically by slaves. Yet, I think this idea should be taken more directly as a revival of an idea of primitive community.
Primitive commune was described as an ideal in the program of Chinese peasant war, too. "In the facilities of charity rice, charity meat and charity dwellings in Guánzhong (today's Shánxi Province) of Zháng Lú, and at a facility by the Lake Tóng-Ting by Zháng-Xiang and Yáng Góng, the situation like commune was observed... that is, they performed in collective and public way. Naturally restricted by class ranks and historical conditions, the commune conceived by those peasants were not a new productive relation but a historically handed-down primitive commune." (Characters, Actions and Characteristics of Peasant' War in Chinese History, Translated by Masatoshi Tanaka, *Rekishì Hyoron*, no. 158, 1963, p.34.) Situation described in this article was indicating the period of Later Han and Sun. Compared with the above, Germans, Celts(Gauls) and Thracians by which Spartacus' Army was formed, they came directly from environment of primitive community. Considering this with their prohibition of individual money possessing, the revival of the idea of primitive community was more direct and actual than that of Chinese. So, it is just illogical of Vogt, S. 27, to define this as "Kriegskommunismus."
- (107) Caesar VI, 22
- (108) Tacitus, *Germania* I, 5, 26
- (109) Oliva, *Sklavenaufstände* S. 85; Caesar II, 15
In this description, Tribe of Nervii didn't allow merchants to come in and didn't allow luxuries to be brought in.
- (110) In the period of Herodotus, it is said that "The Thracians are the biggest nation in the world, ..; were they under one ruler, or united, they would in my judgment be invincible and the strongest nation on earth; but since there is no way or contrivance to bring this about, they are for this reason weak. They have many names, each tribe according to its region." (Herodotos 5, 3) And at the time of Thucydides, "...a considerable portion of the Thracians are independent..." (Thukidides 2, 29). Also in Strabo,

many tribes such as Mysi, Medi, Messi, Coralli, etc. were reported. (Strabo VII, 3, 2-3; VII, 5, 7; VII, 5, 11-12). These indicate that there were no united nations existed among them, and it was at the stage prior to class-society. And at the time of Herodotus, "the idler is most honoured, the tiller of the soil most contemned; he is held in highest honour who lives by war and foray." (Herodotos 5, 6). But even in later period, "all professional soldiers, men who knew not how to plough or to sail the seas, who did not follow the life of herdsmen, but who were ever practising one business and one art, that of fighting and conquering their antagonists." (Tribe of Basternae, Plutarch, *Aemirius Pauls* 12). They were described in Strabo as, "there are 'Wagon-dwellers,' and 'Nomads,' so called, who live off their herds, and on milk and cheese, and know nothing about storing up food or about peddling merchandise either, except the exchange of wares for wares..." (Strabo VII, 5, 12). And they were "*Thraecum gentibus, qui montium editis sine cultuatque eo ferocius agitabant. ... ne regibus quidem parere nisi ex libidine soliti, aut si mitterent auxilia, suos ductores praeficere nec nisi adversum accolas belligerare.*" (Tacitus, *Annales* IV, 3, 46). Thracians were employed by Pergamon and Roma as hired soldiers, but this fact wouldn't contradict what those historical material had indicated above as their stage being primitive community around Thracian regions. As for ancient Thracians, see C. Danov, *Altenthrakien*, Berlin, 1976

- (111) Diodorus XXXIV-V, 2, 4-7; 2, 10-11; Doi, Problems about the First Sicilian Slave Revolt, pp.40, 62-63
- (112) Diodorus XXXVI, 4, 1; 5, 1-3; Doi, A Note on the Second Sicilian Slave Revolt, pp.143, 145-146
- (113) Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.*, p.176; F. Bömer, *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom*, Wiesbaden, 1960, II S.182
- (114) According to Caesar VI, 13: VI, 16-17, priests had already been existed among Gallic society, and they offered sacrifices for their community, and judged the trials of quarrels, crimes and inheritance within their community and tribes. While, among Germanic society, there were no priests nor sacrifices. (Caesar VI, 21) But women were thought to have gifts of prophecy. (Tacitus, *Germania*, I, 8; Plutarch, *Caesar* 19) And Thracian tribes worshipped gods of Ares, Artemis, Hermes, etc. (Herodotos 5, 7) and were affiliated with esoteric religion of Orpheus (Strabo X, 3, 16; Plutarch, *Alexandros* 2; Vergilius, *Georgica*, IV, 507-527) and inspiration worshipping of Dionysus. (Plutarch, *Alexandros* 2; Herodotos 5, 7) Looking at it from religious side, the religion of Thracian tribes had a little more accurate objects. But, in either case, community and religion existed in unified form among them.
- (115) Kovalev, *Veli. Vosst.*, p. 176 says, racial variousness of slaves made a big obstacle for religious ideology in fulfilling an important role in Spartacus' Uprising.
- (116) Plutarch, *Crassus* 8; Appianus, *B. C. I*, 116
- (117) Cassar VI, 23 and Tacitus, *Germania* I, 7 point out that generals were elected by their fortitude.
- (118) Cassar, III, 23: VII, 57: VII, 63
- (119) Sallustius III, 96, 98
- (120) Caesar II, 10: IV, 19: VII, 66: VII, 77, etc.
- (121) In already quoted Tacitus, *Germania* I, 7, the following description is given; "*Reges ex nobilitate, duces ex virtute sumunt, nec regibus infinita aut libera potestas, et duces exemplo potius quam imperio, si prompti, si conspicui, si ante aciem agent, admiratione praesunt.*" This description of "duces" must be corresponding to the slave commanders.
- (122) Livius XCVI; Plutarch, *Crassus* 9; Florus II, 8; Orosius V, 24, 4-5; Doi, *Reconstructing Spartacus Servile War* pp. 72-74

- (123) Plutarch, *Crassus* 11
- (124) Plutarch, *Crassus* 8
- (125) Frontinus, I, 5, 21–22, etc.
- (125a) Florus VIII, 3, 20
- (126) Mommsen III S. 84 says that Spartacus descended from Spartokiden Family (descendants of Bosphoros kings). F. Taeger, *Das Altertum* 1939, S. 701; K. Ziegler, *Die Herkunft des Spartacus*, *Hermes* 83, 1955 SS. 248–249; Diesner S. 151 are also of the same opinion. In case of Mommsen, on one hand he calls Spartacus “a chief of bandits,” and on the other, he seeks his gifted talents of strategy in “royal families.” Ziegler, S. 50 is just like Mommsen on this point, and thinking of his talents, he concludes that Spartacus had to be of leading class descent and was endowed with chivalrous traditions. And Ziegler says, “Auch im Falle des grossen italischen Sklavenaufstandes also ist der führende Revolutionär nicht irgend einer aus der enterdrückten Masse, sondern ein deklassierte Angehöriger der herrschenden Schicht gewesen.” But, Ollivier, p.19-20 opposes that and says “Spartacus descendait-il de la dynastie des Zpardokos qui régna sur le Panticapée? Il serait assez piquant que le chef de la plus formidable insurrection désclaves que connaisse l’histoire, l’homme dont le nom est devenu aujourd’hui le symbole même de la lutte contre l’oppression, descendît d’une famille royale. Malheureusement, nous n’avons, en dehors de la similitude des noms, aucun indice qui permette de l’affirmer.”

But then, how about the actual facts? It had been already pointed out that Spartacus came of Thracians. But as for his past career, there is only one description in Florus II, 8 as “*nec abnuat ille de stipendiario Thrace miles, de milite desertor, inde latro, deinde in honorem virium gladiator.*” In Plutarch *Crassus* 8, he was described as from nomadic tribe (tu nomadikū genūs). Athenaeus IV, 272f says that Spartacus was a native of Thracia. And Varro, *De Rebus Urbanis* III says, “*Spartaco innocente coniects ad gladiatorium,*” and Eratosthenes (Stephan, Byz. 583, 11) says the City of Spartakos as Spartacus’ birthplace. And CIL III 844 is describing about Sparticus as a member of Thracian Bessi tribe in the early period of Roman Empire. Diodorus XII, 31, 2 says about Spartokiden of Bosphoros. And in a Greek myth, there was warrior called Spartoi who was born from a tusk of a dragon which had been sown by Kadmos.

There is no proof that Spartacus was born in Spartokiden. Yet, it is understandable that Münzer, R. E. S. 1929; Oliva-Olivová S. 82; Doer S. 230; Bengtson S. 163 interpreted like the above. And as the historical materials are as I quoted, there are naturally many varied opinions about where Spartacus came from. Mischulin, *Spartacus*, SS. 54–55 suggests that in the name of Spartacus, a mythological name of ‘Spartoi’ is reflected with a legend kept among people. Implied by CIL III 844, Vogt S. 26; Bonghi p. 43 decide Spartacus as from Bessi tribe. And as this tribe of Bessi lived around the foot of Mt. Rodpei, after a novel “Spartaco” was written by Giovagnoli, an assumption that he was born in Rodpei came to be supported by the following historians. A. Musco, *Nola e dinorni*, 1934 p.31; T. Coccanari, *Publio Scrofa – Il tiburtino che sconfisse Spartaco*, *Stov. Ar.* 1951, vol. 24, p.211. Their opinion should be put together with the view that he was of Bessi tribe. In order to aline himself with the view of Florus that his being a bandit, quoting Strabo VII, 5, 12, Vogt S. 26 says Spartacus was a member of a bellicose tribe who had been committing robberies around Rodpei.

Opposing the above opinion, Pareti III p. 689 says Spartacus came from City of Spartaco. And Mahaffy pp. 176–177; Ridley p.36 say he came across the Donau, based on Plutarch’s interpretation of his being a nomadic race. This phrase of Plutarch had been read as ‘tū nomadikū

genūs' and been interpreted as a nomadic race. But Ziegler studied this phrase philologically and interpreted it as 'tu maidikū genūs' (S. 249). That means, this phrase should not be read as a nomadic race, but should be read as the tribe of Maidoi (tribe of Medi). This tribe of Medi was also reported in Strabo, VII, 5, 12. And in Livius LXXXIII; Plutarch, *Sulla* 23 (86 B.C.); Obsequens 59 (75 B.C.), battles between Roman Army and tribe of Medi are recorded. So, it is a strong possibility that Spartacus was a man of Medi tribe. C. Danov of Bulgaria, *Za rodinata na Spartak*, supports Ziegler's opinion, and says that Spartacus had lived along the midstream of River Strouma. Therefore, if it is proper to read the phrase in Plutarch as 'tu maidikū genus,' Spartacus must have been from the tribe of Medi.

The question here is; even if it is proper to decide that he was from tribe of Medi, did he really come from a leading class, or from Spartokiden, or not; as I quoted in the beginning as Ziegler says. In Zeigler's consciousness about this question, in banishing the idea of Spartacus being nomadic race, he seems to be deliberately trying to put Spartacus up in the class of noble family. But this logic is rather inconvincible compared with the one about tribe of Medi. It doesn't have any grounds on which it beats the view of Münzer and Oliva. And with Florus' description in mind, we can't help but deny the assumption that he was from Spartokiden Family. Ziegler must have been drawn to the idea of heroic Spartacus, also. At present, therefore, a clue for finding out the class in which Spartacus was born, has to be either in grasping the facts about Medi tribe, or in the description of Florus.

- (127) Vogt S. 26 says Spartacus didn't have such leading position as to be able to deny everyone's protest. He rather yielded to other leaders and his fellow men for their unique and better insight.
- (128) Motus, *Iz istorii*, p.78
- (129) Sallustius III, 98: 102–103; Orosius V, 24, 3; Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* p. 177; Pareti p. 694; Bonghi p.16; Ward p. 261; Oliva-Olivová S. 91; Drumann IV S. 74; Mommsen III S. 87; Vogt S. 18
- (130) Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* p. 172; Motus, *Iz istorii* p. 77
- (131) Plutarch, *Fabius* 2, 8
- (132) Caesar VI, 23. As for the facts that Gaul-German accepted plunder as natural actions, see Plutarch, *Marius* 11; Caesar I, 11: I, 15: II, 7: II, 9: IV, 9: VII, 11: VII, 42: Tacitus, *Annales* I, 4, 65: XII, 4, 27, etc. By Tacitus, *Annales* IV, 3, 48, it is clear that plunder was taken as a natural action in Thracia also. According to Plutarch, *Marius* 6, plunder was thought to be an admirable action.
- (133) Oliva-Olivová S. 80; Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* p.177; H. Bengtson, *Römische Geschichte*, München, 1967, I, S. 164; and R. H. Hilton points out in his "The Origins of Robin Hood," (*Past & Present* 14), about the brutal way of revenging by medieval peasants against their landlords.
- (134) Ihne VI S. 48
- (135) F. Engels, *Zur Urgeschichte der Deutschen*, *Marx-Engels Werke* 19, S. 446 says, "Die Deutschen hatten die Vertragstreue und Redlichkeit der Römer hinreichend kennengelernt, als Cäsar die Usipeter und Tenkterer während der Unterhandlung und des Waffenstillstands überfiel: sie hatten sie kennengelernt, als Augustus die Gesandten der Sigamber, vor deren Ankunft er jede Verhandlung mit den deutschen Stämmen verweigerte, gefangennehmen liess. Es ist allen erobernden Völkern gemein, ihr Gegner auf jede Art zu überlisten: und dies finden sie ganz in der Ordnung: sobald sich die Gegner jedoch das selbe erlauben, nennen jene es Treubruch und Verrat. Die Mittel aber, die man zur Unterjochung anwendet, müssen auch gestattet sein zur Abwerfung des Jochs. Solange es ausbeutende und beherrschte auf der andern Seite gibt, solange wird die Anwendung der

List neben der Gewalt auf beiden Seiten eine Notwendigkeit sein, gegen die alle Moralpredigt macht los bleibt."

- (136) Polybius, *Historiae*, V, 11; Livius XXXI, 30, 2-3; H. Grotius, *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* III, 5
- (137) Cicero, *De Officiis* III, 6, 30
- (138) Plutarch, *Marius* 27, 42; *Antonius* 45; *Fabius* 22; *Aemirius Paurus* 29; *Marcellus* 19; *Flaminius* 5; *Sertorius* 19; Caesar II, 24; IV, 19; IV, 38; V, 19; VI, 3; VI, 6; VII, 45; Cicero, *pro Lege Manlius* 65; Tacitus, *Annales*, I, 25; XII, 4, 32; Augustinus, *De Civitates Dei* I, 5: 7; Grotius III, 6: 12
According to Plutarch, *Aemirius* 29, Roman Senate clearly declared in favor of plunder.
- (139) Plutarch, *Marius* 44; *Caesar* VII, 28. In *Marius* 44, there is a description as "...butchered fathers of families in their houses, outraged their children, violated their wives..."
- (140) Petronius, *Satyricon* 119:
- (141) Appianus, *Mithr.* 82
- (142) Ollivier p.98; Bonghi p. 14; Oliva-Olivovà S. 90; Ward p. 251; Mischulin, *Spartacus* S. 65; Vogt S. 27
- (143) For instance, about the revolts of Chimei in 1st century, Juzo Kawaji says in his *Revolts of Chimei (Red Eye-Brows) and Foundation of the Later Han Dynasty*, (*Rekishigaku Kenkyu*, no.161, 1953, p.18,) as the expansion of their power, autonomous regulations were required. The regulations set by themselves at that time was as simple as 'Share equally; death penalty for killers; compensations for injuries.' And these regulations were ordered 'only verbally...'. As we can imagine by their system, troubles must have been solved autonomously, following the tradition of the community. So, it is not right to interpret this that they were not able to actualize regulated laws. Much less, it is nonsense to define this group as a mob for having or not having regulated laws." Skipping the time a little, at the Chün-chán Rebellion of 10th century, it is said that "In this riot, 'capable men were employed, good deeds were encouraged, orderly restriction was emphasized, and no crimes had been committed.' And this riot is noted as they marched under strict discipline with good order, suitable enough to be people's army." by Makoto Ikeda "The Chün-chán Rebellion, the Ssu-chuan District During the Early Sung Period," (*Rekishigaku Kenkyu*, no. 152, 1951, p.12.). Shigeki Kaizuka, *Chinese History*, vol. 1, p.181, compares this strict military discipline among revolting peasants with the government army, and says, "Trying to pacify Chimei, Wàng Mang sent a large army, commanded by generals, Wàng Kuang and Ryum Tàn. The government soliders were more vicious than revolting peasants and they plundered everywhere. So the local people sang a song, 'We'd rather encounter Chimei than Wàng Kuang; Wang Kuang is a little better than Ryum Tàn; because Ryum Tàn will take our lives.' Corruption and inferiority of soldiers who had been sent by central government, and antipathy against them by the local people along with their warm feeling toward revolting peasants, are well expressed in this song." Even though the historical background differs, this kind of comparison is also applied to slave armies and Roman Army.

Not only in the ancient period, people's army, endeavoring to be freed from oppression, is always a very orderly regulated military group, according to R. H. Hilton and H. F. Fagan, *The English Rising of 1381*, London, 1950; M. Bensing u. S. Hoyer, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg 1524-1526*, Leibzig, 1965; E. Snow, *Red Star over China*, London, 1937; Vo Nguyen Giap, *Guerre de pueple, Armée du pueple*, Hanoi, 1961. etc.

- (143a) P. A. Brunt, *Social Conflicts in the Roman Republic*, London 1971, p.115; K. P. Korjeva, *Vosstanie Spartaka v Sovetskoi istoriografii, Voprosii Istorii* 1974 no.10, p.133, assume only a very few free men.

- (144) Mischulin, Spartacus, SS.71–73
- (145) Mischulin, Spart. vosst. p.93
- (146) Kovalev, Veli. vosst., p.179; By Ratner p.55, "If Crixos, Cannicus and Castus were the representatives of peasants like Mischulin says, thirty to forty thousands of men must have gathered under each of these representatives, then, at the time of revolt, almost half... about a third of the revolting army should have been occupied by them. This much of free men couldn't have joined the army". Moreover, according to Ratner, (1) victory over these units had been recorded as the victory over slaves in historical material, and (2) if this much of free men participated in the revolt, Roman Senate should naturally have taken some policies, trying to detach free men from slaves, but in actuality, they didn't take any of that. So, the structure of the separation armies couldn't have been of peasants."
- (147) Mischulin, Spartacus, SS. 71–73
- (148) Plutarch, *Marius* 11
- (149) Mischulin, Spart. vosst. pp. 133–134; Tibiletti, Rev. Vogt, pp.151–152; G. Tibiletti, Lo sviluppo del latifondo in Italia dall' epoca graccana al principio dell' Impero, Rel. X Congi. Sc. St. II, Firenze 1955, p.272, p.274; Diesner S. 162 think it as possible of allies between slaves and free men.
- (150) Kovalev, Klassovaja, boriba i padenie antičnogo obscestva, (*IGAIMK* 100, - 1933); says, "In spite of a big difference between free poor men and slaves, they had a close contact with each other, as we can see some examples in Spartacus' Uprising." But, Kovalev, Veli. vosst. p.179. 1934 says, there is no proof about the participation of agricultural elements in Spartacus' Army. He criticizes Mischulin's as overestimation, emphasizing the depth of rupture between slaves and free men and he suggests this rupture to be resolved in the 2nd stage of "Slave Revolution." This "Slave Revolution" means a theory which claims slavery society being demolished by "Slave Revolution," influenced by the speeches of Stalin (*Stalin Werke* 13, Moskva p.239). This theory was the main stream at that time among Soviet historians. The theory claims the transition from Republic into Empire as the first stage of "Slave Revolution," and falling period of Roman Empire after 4th cent. as the second stage of "Slave Revolution."
- (151) S.P. Uttschenko, Die historische Bedeutung des Spartacusaufstand (Preface of Mischulin's Spartacus); As this was prior to the process of the criticism against Stalin, the review against Mischulin could be restrained to this degree, but Uttschenko, Krizis i padenie Rimskoi respubliki, Moskva, 1965, pp.145–146 blames him that being poisoned by Stalin's idea of "Slave Revolution," he regarded Roman slaves in the same light with today's proletariats. The assumption that allies of slaves and poor men existed, could be nothing but a very queer 'modernization.'
- (152) Bonghi p.30; Ihne VI S. 46; Lauffer S. 375; Vogt SS. 54–55; Gramsci p.196; M. I. Finley, Was Greek Civilization Based on Slave Labour? *Historia* 8 (1959) pp.156–157; M. Capozza, Le rivolte servili di Sicilia nel quadro della politica agraria romana, *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti*, a.119, t.115, 1956–57, CXV p.96; Vogt notes on the point that poor proletariats themselves didn't exist as a united class, but they were divided into poor peasants and starving citizens. K. O. Kautsky, *Der Ursprung des Christentums* 1908 (trans. by Mneo Kondo) p.202 points out the depth of gaps between slaves and *proletarii* as follows; slaves who had been employed by noble men gave a damage to *proletarii* who had been led by Gaius Gracchus; on the other hand, Roman *proletarii* who had been commanded by Crassus subjugated the slave revolts by Spartacus.
- (153) Oliva, Sklavenaufstände S. 79; Oliva, Bedeutung der antiken Sklaverei, *Acta Antiquae* V III3–4, 1960, SS. 316–317
- (154) Weber S. 244

IV. Thought of Slave Liberation

— Two ways for liberating slaves —

By the last chapter, it has been cleared that neither of those three opinions is admissible. If we cannot find the cause of discord and disunity in those three, then, where shall we look for it? Or, should we take it as there was no discord, disunity nor disruption existed in Spartacus' Army, as Pareti claims? Pareti's opinion is surely a very interesting one, (see p.5) and according to Appianus, the separation units were merely "the Spartacans, who were encamped somewhere in a detached position ⁽¹⁾", and no incident of discord or disunity is reported. But, by Pareti's opinion, we cannot explain effectively the factual existence of contradiction, discord and disunity in Spartacus' Army, described in Sallustius, Plutarch and others. This is the definite weak point in Pareti's opinion. If the discord and disunity really existed, the cause for them must have existed, too. In this case, we have to take note that these three opinions can not help but be conscious of the said two contradicting courses of Spartacus' schemes. One of them is to leave from Italia and try to liberate slaves in their home lands, and the other is to stay in Italia and keep on plundering, revenging, and marching toward Roma. To these opinions Motus and Ratner presented another opinion. By Motus, there couldn't be an escape from Italia without destroying Roma, so the two courses should not be taken as a contradiction. With this idea in mind, he attributes the problem of contradiction to the problem of strategies and tactics at each occasion ⁽²⁾. Of course, under actual situation of each case, some contradictions might have occurred, caused by such problems as strategies and tactics. But, the source of this actual contradiction still remains unsolved. Yet, the above indication by Motus is objectively very accurate, because, even if Spartacus' Army could have crossed over the Alps, they should have been destroyed by Roman forces by the time they reached their home lands. In this sense, without destroying slavery state of Roma neither escape from Italia nor liberation of slaves was possible. However, it is a completely different matter whether it should objectively be so, or actual historical facts of the matter was really so. For us who live in the present time, it is rather easy to point out as the above, but for the slave mass and for Spartacus, it is very doubtful if they could grasp and realize the general situation at the time. As the historical materials such as Sallustius and Plutarch describe, and also as the said three opinions admit frankly, they must have been two completely different

schemes and courses of that time.

Therefore, even with the objection by Motus and others, further study on what caused their plan to become two different ones is necessary. As it has been cleared in the 3rd Chapter, they were neither the conflicts of plans between slave leaders and the slave mass, nor between races and tribes, nor between slaves and peasants. In order to study what caused their plan to be devided, firstly we have to know the precise substance of these two courses.

One of them is a slave liberating course by leaving from Italia; "since he could not expect to overcome the Roman power, began to lead his army toward the Alps, thinking it necessary for them to cross the mountains and go to their respective homes, some to Thracia, and some to Gallia ⁽³⁾". It has been approved by the most scholars that most of those slaves, represented by Spartacus, with to prefer this course ⁽⁴⁾. The substance in Plutarch's description seems to include the whole hard experiences of these slaves. Even though these were written not by the slaves themselves but by a member of ruling class, Plutarch, these expressions themselves had been derived from the factual situations of the slaves in Spartacus' Uprising. Since most of them had been captured into slaves, defeated and conquered by Roman Army, they must have encountered many a such occasion in which they had to experience the strength of Roman Army. This must have led them to recognize the difficulty of defeating Roman Army — Roman 'Empire' — completely ⁽⁵⁾. Moreover, in their slave life in Roma, with hard labour under cruel masters, longing for the freedom, they rebelled and planned escapes, sometimes individually, and sometimes by groups. But all of which resulted in vain efforts. Under such situation, when Spartacus started uprising, slaves thought "Spartacus als ein unverhofft erschienener Erlöser ⁽⁶⁾" and joined his army one after another. Most of them were captives ⁽⁷⁾ who had known their home lands, and "dabei grossenteils selbst ehemalige Freie oder Söhne Freigelassener. Unter ihnen musste also noch am meisten lebendiger, wenn auch nach aussen ohnmächtiger Hass gegen ihre Lebenslage vorhanden sein ⁽⁸⁾". Therefore, it is understandable that they dreamed of free life in their home lands after the liberation ⁽⁹⁾. This restoration of free life in their home lands was undoubtedly the original, heart-felt wish of theirs who had been bought to alien countries ^(9a). This wish of theirs had been kept incessantly in their heart under the life of such exploitation and oppression. But, the important matter here is the fact that their first step of actualizing their dream was taken in the form of getting-out-of-Italia. The way to their home lands would have been open only after "cross(ing) the Alps". This idea could have only been thought up by

Germans of Cimbri and Teutoni who had come to invade Italia crossing over the Alps, or Celts (Gauls) who had been brought there as captives, crossing over the Alps; and could not be the idea of Spartacus who had come from Thracia. As for the way to get out of Italia, they must have had lots of discussions. Each slave must have joined in them with his own experience and knowledge ⁽¹⁰⁾. And they had come to decide their way. It is the fact that Plutarch has described in his book of "Crassus". The course of liberation was a concentration of slaves' whole experience, endeavoring to overcome all these experiences which were an accumulation of all the hardships and failure of their past. And Spartacus was the one who endeavored to actualize all these wish of slave mass. But, while this slave liberation course was a concentrated accumulation of slaves' past experience, it was thoroughly a new, unknown course for them ⁽¹¹⁾, too.

The other course was the one to stay in Italia, to march toward Roma, plundering and revenging. As for the actual significance of the course, this was one of the ways to liberate the slaves. But, though it let slaves relieve themselves of the state of slaves, still it could neither destruct the old productive relations based on slavery, nor construct a new productive relations. This course was only aiming at the reverse situation - slaves turn to be a ruling class, and rule over other classes. In this sense, marching toward Roma meant nothing but to build a slave monarchy in which slaves would take place of ruling class, after destructing the slavery state of Roma. And this course had already been tried in the First and the Second Sicilian Slave Uprisings. At the First Sicilian Slave Uprising, such kind of slave monarchy was founded by a slave, Eunus. This monarchy was another slavery state with "slaves" who were once slave owners. In this monarchy, former slave was a king at the summit, and council members of once revolted slaves were supporting him with people's conference as a ruling organization. By this organization, he ruled over cities, peasants who were the primary productive power, and those new "slaves" at the bottom ⁽¹²⁾. In the Second Sicilian Slave Uprising, as for the ruling organization, it was almost similar to that of the First Uprising, but it was a monarchy in which they didn't occupy cities, but instead, slave mass administered the land of former slave owners, cooperatively, and ruled over peasants ⁽¹³⁾. This state was founded by means of revenge against former slave owners, plunder out of them and confiscated their lands. It doesn't matter much here if these slaves who joined Spartacus' Army were conscious of this Sicilian slave monarchy or not. In the slavery society of those days we have to notice that even if they would have succeeded in revenge and plunder in Italia, their course had to be inevitably directed

toward slave monarchy, another slavery state in which liberated slaves would be the new ruling class and rule over the old ruling class ⁽¹⁴⁾. And for these uprisen slaves, revenge and plunder were very natural and definite demand which had been grown spontaneously among them. By taking this course, their uprising would have been turned into such direction, with their liberty guaranteed, and their actual demands secured by a kind of organized warranty.

We have found out that there were two different courses of slave liberation at the depth of these two schemes. One of them was to leave from Italia and liberate themselves on the way to their home lands; and the other was to build a slave monarchy for their liberation. The difference between these two courses of liberation conceived the fatal problem in Spartacus' Army. Although these two courses brought the discord and disunity to his army, they couldn't be conscious as two different opinions by the slave mass, but as different judgements and attitudes towards their situations. In this sense, the process of Spartacus' Uprising could be defined as a struggling process of the two courses.

The separation of Crixos ⁽¹⁵⁾ happened right at the process of settling a new course for the slave liberation, and of marching toward North to actualize their plan of getting out of Italia. Even then, the slave mass couldn't have kept the definite opinion constantly. They must have been agitated between these two courses, and shifted their attitude with the change of circumstances. Wage labourers, small lessees and *proletarii* who participated in the uprising must have played some roles in this agitation of the slaves. For, even though they couldn't help but be conscious of land confiscation, they must have preferred the second course, also. In this way, even though their numbers had been very little, their participation in the Army must have spurred some agitation among slaves at the struggling process of the two courses, and brought in decadant atmosphere to the camps. Agitations among slaves could restrict even Spartacus. The fact that he had to retrace the way down to South, leaving the Alps just in front of him ⁽¹⁶⁾, indicates that he had to give up the first course for a time being ⁽¹⁷⁾. 'After retracing the way down South, he determined to seize Sicilia and thought to kindle anew third slave uprising ⁽¹⁸⁾. This plan of Spartacus was a kind of progressed idea of the first course. Because, actual plan of the first course had been; after "crossing the Alps", liberate slaves to their respective home lands. But at this process, they gave up the idea of "crossing the Alps" and tried to look for more practical way to get out of Italia. Yet, on the other hand, if they could have succeeded in crossing over to Sicilia, they might have joined their forces together with Sicilian slaves, and taken the course of turning themselves into a slave monarchy. After an

unsuccessful try of crossing over to Sicilia, Spartacus broke the siege at Bruttium by Crassus, and tried to leave from Italia through Brundisium in order to liberate slaves on the way ⁽¹⁹⁾. But, at that process, Castus and Cannicus separated from his army, and people who supported the second course compelled him to keep fighting with Roman Army. However, Spartacus and his supporters still wanted to liberate themselves on the way out of Italia, marched toward Brundisium and fought heroically till the end against the siege and attack of the enormous Roman Army ⁽²⁰⁾.

Consequently, I'd just like to point out that; firstly, the cause of discord and disunity in Spartacus' Army was based on the conflict of these two slave liberation courses, and secondly, the process of Spartacus' Uprising was equal to that of the two struggling courses when we study the cause internally and subjectively.

In fact, through these two violent struggling courses in Spartacus' Army, and on the other hand, through fighting with Roman Army, the course of 'liberation by leaving from Italia' came to be grasped more firmly, developed into a more practical plan, and recognized more clearly by the slaves. After experiencing much agitations and shiftings, slave mass began to turn to the first course as the desire of a whole mass, and started to look for the way to actualize it earnestly ⁽²¹⁾. In their process of searching more practical way to go back home, this course began to have potentiality of a ideology, idealized and refined all along the way. That is: after the plan of 'going back home, crossing over the Alps', came to be baffled, the plan of 'crossing to Sicilia' was proposed; and then, after this new attempt also ended in frustration, the plan of leaving from Italia by way of Brundisium came to be thought out. In this way, in spite of several frustrations, their first course came to be formed into a more practical plan through all these processes and, along the way, it came to be developed and refined as a ideology.

One of the significances of Spartacus' Uprising in the history of social thought is this proposition of a completely new course — to go back home to liberate slaves — which was an accumulation of slaves' whole experiences under the historical condition of that time. The other is, this new course won a victory over the old in the struggle between the old and new during the process of the uprising. Of course, this victory of the new course is essentially a different matter from the actual defeat of Spartacus' Uprising. In this process Spartacus fought with slave mass to bring in victory to the new course and it is the reason that the glorious name of Spartacus is remembered even today among us.

As this course of slave liberation was a thoroughly new trial, many objections and oppositions must have been raised among them, but in any way, the proposition itself of new course had a big significance in this uprising. Besides the novelty of this course, it is presumable that they began to be conscious of the solidarity of their uprising with others, and this fact seems to add another significance to this uprising. To prove this presumption, there is an evidence that Spartacus planned to cross to Sicilia to break out the third slave uprising there. Having experienced the first and the second slave uprisings, there was still very unrestful among slaves in Sicilia ⁽²²⁾. The following description seems to indicate that Spartacus had known the situation in Sicilia, and planned to cross over to the island. "At the Straits, he chanced upon some Cilician pirate craft, and determined to seize Sicilia. By throwing two thousand men into the island, he thought to kindle anew the servile war there" ⁽²³⁾. Until Spartacus' Uprising, there was no precedent of this kind that uprisen slaves deliberately tried to raise another uprising in other places; not even at the time when the first and the second slave uprisings suppressed all over Sicilia, and founded a slave monarchy. This was a newly presented point in Spartacus' Uprising in the process of the slave liberating movements. But then, the reason of their such a wide view should be studied. The key to solve the question must be in the pirate.

It is a well known fact that at that time there were many pirates running about free in the Mediterranean Sea ⁽²⁴⁾. These pirates were mainly formed of Cilicians and declined natives of Italia, Hispania and Asia; and natives from Asia Minor who had lost their property after the war of Mithridates, and slaves who had been liberated by Mithridates had also joined them ⁽²⁵⁾. The fact that many people were reduced join the pirates by the contradiction of Roman society gave the anti-Roman character to the piracy ⁽²⁶⁾. Yet on the other hand, these pirates had a close connection with Roman slave owners by the slave trade, providing the slave, the basic labour power of Roman society ⁽²⁷⁾. As the pirates had a double-character of this kind, they didn't choose ways for gaining their profits. They were cosmopolitan merchants in this sense. They had been taking contacts with Mithridates of Pontus, and at the same time with Sertorius of Espania, working as a medium in making an alliance with each other ⁽²⁸⁾. So, naturally they wouldn't refuse to trade with Spartacus' Army which had started fighting against Roma. In order to reinforce their armaments, Spartacus must have purchased iron and copper from these piratic merchants ⁽²⁹⁾. Those gold and silver which had been prohibited to be owned privately, and been pooled as their common property, must have been used for purchasing these

metals. By taking contacts with these pirates, they must have been given various informations about anti-Roman struggles of Pontus, Espania and Thracia, or the situations of Sicilia. As Mithridates knew the participation of Italians to Spartacus' Army ⁽³⁰⁾, so must have Spartacus known about the anti-Roman movements in those Roman provinces through the information from these pirates. As the result, Mithridates could imagine such a big scheme of 'going to Gallia through Germania, and with the help of Gauls, invade into Italia, when being attacked in Asia Minor by Roman Army ⁽³¹⁾ ; and Spartacus could offer a new course of slave liberation by getting out of Italia. As they had such a international view, in spite that they were slaves, the oppressed people, they tried to cross towards Sicilia, and soon after their failure, changed the plan to leave from Italia through marching towards Brundisium. On the way to Brundisium, when Spartacus learned that Lucullus had just landed there from Thracia, he gave up all of his scheme, and brought his forces to close quarters with Crassus ⁽³²⁾. It is important that the success of Lucullus in Thracia gave the fatal damage to Spartacus' scheme leaving from Italia to go back to Thracia, their home land.

In the last chapter, I pointed out the structure of Spartacus' Army as that of primitive community. But as their view was such an international one, it backed up the structure, and intensified the energy from within the structure itself. In this sense, this international view must have helped a great deal in the development of this slave liberation course. By the medium of the structure of primitive community, based on the spontaneous activities of the slave themselves and their old life as free men, the slaves must have been concentrated and accumulated their experiences which become a source of the energy of their activities. With such international view at hand, they must have been able to reflect, even if not sufficiently, experiences of the past uprisings and present anti-Roman movements upon Spartacus' Army. In this sense, Spartacus' Uprising could be defined as 'a settlement of over-all account' of slave uprisings and peoples' movements from second century B.C. to first century B.C.

As we already studied, this slave liberation course was presented by the combination of energy and most international view of theirs, even with such historical limitations. When the slaves desired their freedom, naturally their basic demand was to restore their former conditions — before the time they were forced into slavery. The slaves from battle fields must have wished to go back home, but even then, according to their classes and by their social conditions at home lands, their hopes must have been varied among them. Some of them must have hoped to

be back to the life style of primitive community, and some must have wanted to become free peasants, and still some must have wished to be slave owners. And those who had been turned into slaves for losing their lands, surely dreamed of recovering their lands ⁽³³⁾. In this general situation, as Spartacus' Army was formed mostly of those people who had been living in primitive community of Gallia, Germania, and Thracia, so when they wanted to return to their home lands, they undoubtedly wanted to reconstruct a social order prior to that of slavery society – return to the life style of primitive community ⁽³⁴⁾. But is it proper to decide them as anachronistic, passive, or reactionary ⁽³⁵⁾? It must be indeed an easy thing to comment that when wishing their freedom and liberation, the only thing they could think up was to return to 'good-old-days' – the life style of primitive community and this came from their lack of class consciousness and awareness ⁽³⁶⁾. And it must be also very easy to point out that these slaves didn't have any purposeful program with which they would abolish slavery system or establish a new society ⁽³⁷⁾. However, when we consider the maturity of slavery society at that time... that is, slavery system was on its way of progress, while a new uklad to take its place was not yet mature enough... it is only natural that slaves could only think up their liberation within this limitation. There are only a few documents to verify the thinking way of slaves at those times ⁽³⁸⁾. Moreover, in the slavery society, "die Klasse, welche die herrschende materielle Macht der Gesellschaft ist, ist zugleich ihre herrschende geistige Macht. Die Klasse, die die Mittel zur materiellen Produktion zu ihrer Verfügung hat, disponiert damit zugleich über die Mittel zur geistigen Produktion, so dass ihr damit zugleich im Durchschnitt die Gedanken derer denen die Mittel zur geistigen Produktion abgehen, unterworfen sind ⁽³⁹⁾". General situation in slavery society was as such. Yet, in the Later Roman Republic, most of the slaves had been once free, or decendants of free men, so there must have remained some of the ideology among them which had been formed in their former lives. So, their religious ideology had to be along the line of religious heritage in which they had once lived ⁽⁴⁰⁾, and if they were suffereing such horrible exploitation, and "*Humana ante oculos foede cum vita/in terris oppressa gravi sub religione/quae caput a caeli regionibus ostendebat/horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans* ⁽⁴¹⁾", the ideology of their past life must have been kept in their heart even if subconsciously. As they kept having the wishes for freedom under such conditions, even a slave owner had to admit that

"Amici, et servi homines sunt et aequae unum lactem biberunt, etiam si illos malus fatus oppressit. Tamen me salvo cito aquam liberam

gustabunt ⁽⁴²⁾ .”

When the slaves thought of freedom and liberation, they naturally connected the idea with the lives of their past community. Therefore, it is not proper to interpret them as reactionary or passive, even if they had dreamed of restoring the lives of the past primitive community.

Among religious ideologies which had been kept by slaves, most notable one was the religion of Orpheus. It is a well-known fact that this religion had been believed around many places in Thracia ⁽⁴³⁾ , and a woman from the same tribe as Spartacus' had some connection with this mystic religion of Orpheus ⁽⁴⁴⁾ . If so, it is presumable that Spartacus had been influenced by Orphism, or at least, by Orphic way of thinking. He might have known the religious chant of Orphism that says, “I have flown off the wheel of misery/ And with swift feet attained the longed-for crown ⁽⁴⁵⁾ ”. In the harsh life of a gladiator, he might have thought of the following sentences; trying to get rid of the chain — “the wheel” — which fastened slaves by hands and feet, “They could not rest content with what they had, because they had nothing, and their hopes were as infinite as their desires. All life was strife and struggle, and if only man would run the race with courage, there was none so humble and debased but, he might win the prize of glory and become a god ⁽⁴⁶⁾ ”. This kind of thinking must have been connected with their desire for regaining freedom, and it led Spartacus to prepare for organizing the uprising.

With uprisings by such masses of slaves could they break Roman Army, and were able to organize such slave army as comparable to that of Roman's; backed-up by these facts, they could present such a course as going back home by leaving from Italia. Until that time, under harsh exploitation of slavery system, they had been only dreaming of returning to their primitive community life. This private wish of theirs grew to be more practical, and more actual way of liberation through the discussions among the uprisen masses. What uplifted their private wish of once a more dream to the height of slave liberation course of returning home, was the power of slave uprising in such great numbers, by which their wish was secured and was able to defeat Roman Army again and again. If slaves of only a small number might have risen, they could never have presented such a course of liberation. That is why even when they were troubled with many agitations, or objections and oppositions, slave mass clung to this course and made them fight consistently with Romans to fulfill their wishes. That was why the Great Roma had to try suppressing the uprising with all its forces and might ⁽⁴⁷⁾ . Yet, even with the concentration of their whole power, the resistance of slave classes was still a very feeble and powerless one,

compared with the mighty state power of Roma which had been growing into a World Empire.

Under such situations, the thought of slave liberation — leave from Italia to go back to home lands — had but to be turned into imaginary in actuality. In other words, under such political, social and economical conditions in the Later Roman Republic, even this newly presented course, too, couldn't help but be turned into another improbable one. We have been talking about "the two courses of slave liberation", but under those conditions neither of them could bring liberation for slaves objectively. Both of these two courses were significant in the sense that slaves tried to liberate for themselves by their own movements and uprisings. One of the two courses — as for the way to a slave monarchy — it could build an organization which guaranteed their freedom permanently by taking the regional power from slave owners. In spite of the above fact, this course only led them to a contradiction that they would make themselves a new ruling class in which they would objectively exploit other classes. The other course — to go home to liberate themselves — was presented with the recognition of Roman strength. But, Roman state power was even greater than they could ever have realized. Moreover, the conflicts and disagreements in slave army had come to lead the course to an improbable imagination. But, the course to a slave monarchy had a rather important meaning too; because, until that time, the form of slave resistance against slave owners had been only by disobediences or escapes by individuals or by small groups at most, but, in this occasion, for the first time, it had grown at a leap to be a great mass uprising of such large scale, with the hopes of overthrowing slave owners. (The development of *latifundium*, in which masses of slaves lived together, was indispensable to this event.) Although this course had brought such a leaping experience for slave liberating movements, it also had a contradiction and weak point that it would result in turning themselves into a ruling class. Meanwhile, the thought of slave liberation to go back home was a leap beyond the other one, for in this course, they refused to make themselves a ruling class and wished their freedom for themselves in their home lands, and with such thought, they tried to overcome the course to a slave monarchy. This course must have been an utmost goal of slave liberation which could be thought up by slaves themselves under such historical conditions ⁽⁴⁸⁾. And, if this utmost goal had but to be turned into imaginary again, the liberation of slaves for themselves at that process must have been still a dream that couldn't be fulfilled then. Even though it ended in a dream, this movement of liberation had a positive significance in the stream of macro-history, if we look at it

objectively. Slaves had been deprived of "primitive, abiogenetic democracy" by Roman power... the life they had once been enjoying in primitive community. In their wishes of going back home, their demands for restoring the "primitive, abiogenetic democracy" was also included, even if not consciously. In other words, by Spartacus' Uprising slaves tried to regain their "primitive, abiogenetic democracy" which had been robbed from them by their oppressors when the class society had been built up. And this uprising became one of the most important starting points in the later movements to seek freedom, equality and democracy by oppressed people^(48a). Of course, this movements must have to be continued until the real classless society would be accomplished.

In this chapter, I pointed out that basic cause of discord and disunity in Spartacus' Army came from the conflict of those two courses for slave liberation, and also, between those two, the course of going back home to liberate slaves by leaving from Italia was a thoroughly new, utmost way for them with such historical conditions of the time. At the time of the first and the second Sicilian Slave Uprisings, they could only present a course of liberation to be a slave monarchy. This leads to a question of why at the time of Spartacus' Uprising, could they think up such a new idea, and where were the objective conditions for its representation. It should be noted that the surrounding international situations of anti-Roman struggles were definitely different from Sicilian Uprisings to Spartacus'. These objective conditions, along with the masses of slaves gathering up under him, let Spartacus have the idea that he might be able to leave from Italia and go home where Roman domination was not so strong yet, even if not possible to destroy the whole domination of Roman ruling system.

As for the reason why Spartacus didn't take the course to a slave monarchy, Kovalev interpreted it as follows; Firstly, "in actuality, there wasn't any restful or peaceful moment in the process of their uprising. There wasn't any moment of "pause" for them to prepare for more solid organization. "The stage of their uprising" was right in the center of their enemy — so close to Roma from where all fresh troops were sent out in succession. Spartacus had to fight in field with the condition of moving battles". And secondly, "racial construction of slaves under Spartacus' leadership was too various for forming any controlling system which would satisfy each one equally⁽⁴⁹⁾". This interpretation of Kovalev surely is attacking one side of the situation sharply which must have played the important role in deciding the course of going back home. Yet, we cannot estimate this course of going back home only so

passively as Kovalev did. We had better look for the definite dividing point of these two courses, in the difference of social structure from where slaves came over. That means, as I already made analyses, in Spartacus' Uprising, its main force was of Celts (Gauls), Germans and Thracians who had the lives of primitive community, and not yet experienced the class society. Meanwhile, in the first and the second Sicilian Slave Uprisings, their main force was of Sicilian natives who had been turned into slaves, and Syrians-Cilicians who had came from Hellenistic society, and they had already been suffering hardships under Roman domination or under eastern despotic government ^(49a). Therefore, Sicilian slaves had been living in the slavery society before they were ever turned into slaves, and their lives had been very close to those of slaves even when free. So, it was rather natural of them that they didn't have any strong desire for returning home ⁽⁵⁰⁾, even if the uprisings were broken out in a closed situation as an island of Sicilia without international informations. On the other hand, as for Spartacus' Uprising, the factors of primitive community were still remained active among them, and those made the slaves keenly aware of "freedom" and made them think up such a course as going back home. This outwardly "retrospective" and "reactional" wish of theirs was, because of its earnest demand of "freedom" and its refusal to make themselves new rulers, able to become a powerful antithesis against the dominative ideology of slavery system, and also was able to direct slaves toward a new course of liberation. But, with such condition as slaves from other countries or poor peasants and *proletarii* who had experienced class society before, also joined this uprising, and by the agitations among these slave masses who had been away too long from home lands, this course had to be fought in the army desperately with the other course of slave monarchy and they couldn't help but build up a basic cause for discord and disunity in Spartacus' Army.

(1) Appianus, *B. C.* I, 118

(2) Motus, *Iz istorii* pp.68-70

(3) Plutarch, *Crassus* 9

(4) Mommsen III S.84; Mahaffy p.177; Ward p. 257, p.266; Rostovtzeff, *Geschichte der Alten Welt* II. Bremen S.181; Vogt S.38; Coccanari p.242; Oliva, *Sklavenaufstände* S.82; Oliva-Olivová SS.80-90; Olivier p.101; Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* p.166; Kagarov, p.19; Ratner p.56; Mischulin, *Spartacus*, SS.68-74; Baldwin p.291; Tamaki p.79.

Of course there are objections to this opinion. According to Bonghi p.17, slaves didn't have any intentions of going back home. They walked around Italia, called for the slaves to rise up, kept on plundering, in order to let Roma sign an agreement with them. Brisson pp.212-213 says, these were all fabrications by Roman ruling class.

(5) Oliva-Olivová SS.80-90; Oliva, *Sklavenaufstände*, S.82; Tamaki p.79; Coccanari p.242. says "even though 75,000 slaves were concentrated under

- Spartacus, they were still too little in number compared with one million slaves of Italia.”
- (6) Most S.92
 - (7) At that time, most of the slaves were captives by conquered or plundered, and they knew their home lands. Those who had been born slaves were very few. After Spartacus' Uprising, it was proved to be very dangerous to have too many captives, so after that, numbers of *vernae* who born at home increased, and this brought the custom of marriages for slaves. Varro II, I, 26; II, X 6; Frank, Survey p.383; Vogt S.38.
 - (8) F. Engels, Bruno Bauer und das Urchristentum, *Marx-Engels Werke* 19, S. 302
 - (9) Vogt S.38
 - (9a) J. Lester, *To be a Slave*, New York 1968 (Japanese Translation, p.102); This is a description by Ball, a negro slave who was brought from Africa and were compelled to work in a large slavery plantation in the south of U.S.A. in 19th century. According to him, these negro slaves were, without exception, dreaming of going back to their home lands after their deaths, to have happy lives. See M. Doi, *Spartacus' Uprising*, Tokyo, 1973, pp. 104–105, also.
 - (10) Sallustius III, 96, 98. By his opinion, they had intended to go back home by getting out of Italia, just after the uprising started... at the time of suppressing Campania (before advancing to Lucania). But this plan didn't get many supports. (Münzer, R. E. S. 1531) The way to get out of Italia must have been discussed during the winter encampment of Thurii, in 73 B.C. During this encampment, practical way to get out of Italia such as described in Plutarch must have been decided: To a proposition of the course by Spartacus, Germans and Gauls added their opinions, and further slaves must have lots of discussions based on such informations, which had been brought by pirates, as intensification of anti-Roman struggles by Sertorius, Mithridates and Thracians. (Doi, Reconstructing Spartacus, Servile War, pp. 64–65)
Münzer, R. E. S. 1532 says; after the separated units of Crixos were destroyed by Roman Army, Spartacus realized that it was impossible to defeat Roma, and planned to leave from Italia. Yet, I don't agree with this opinion. Oliva presents a new opinion: With the consideration of anti-Roman struggles in remote regions, Spartacus not only kept hopes to have free life in the home land, but also had the idea that the escape to the district of not yet under the control of Roman "Empire" was the only way to a slave liberation. And so, he tried to attack Roman Army with the supports of those tribes in remote regions, as Gallia, Thracia, Germania and Iberia. (Oliva-Olivová SS.88–90; Oliva, Sklavenaufstände S.82 S.86
 - (11) Vogt S.38 appraises this course as a very valuable and important one. Oliva, Sklavenaufstände S.82 esteems this program as very great.
 - (12) Doi, Problems on the First Sicilian Slave Revolt, pp.56–60; Reconstructing the First Sicilian Slave Uprising I, *Senshu Shigaku*, no.4, 1972, p.35, pp. 43–50
 - (13) Doi, A Note on the Second Sicilian Slave Revolt, pp.162–169; Basic Characters of the Second Sicilian Slave Uprising, *Senshu Shigaku*, no.6, 1974, pp.23–30
 - (14) There are many opinions if uprisings of oppressed class in ancient slavery society could have built a new society or not... but negative opinions are predominant. Yet, even in those opinions, there are many differences in their nuances.
S. Ishimoda discusses this in "An Introduction to the Political History of Later Ancient Japan" I, Tokyo, 1956, p.52, "When Sicilian Slave Revolt achieved the victory for a short period, their leader, Eunus made himself an absolute monarch of the East... In the last stage of the ancient society,

they had incomprehensible characters on which complicated social structure of the time were reflected." He compares this uprising with the Revolt of Masakado Taira of Japan and the Revolt of Huáng Cháo of China. In the Revolt of Masakado, its characteristics were "firstly, he tried to build an independent small state and secondly the state he built was an imitation of the Ancient Emperor State of Kyoto." (p.45.) And in the Revolt of Huáng Cháo, "although he tried to resist against ancient state, when he gained the authority, only structure he could build was tragically another state exactly similar to the former structure." (p.52.) So, when we generalize the revolts in later ancient society, they were commonly and consistently "in the tendency of building independent local monarchies, opposing the state of concentrative authority." (p.46) It is clearly a factual error of Ishimoda's that he takes Sicilian Slave Revolts as the revolts in later ancient society. But, in this case, let us only note his theoretical indication that revolts in ancient slavery societies were to be restricted by the social structure, and they could build nothing but imitations of the ancient state. Ishimoda tries to take this problem of Japanese ancient history as common to that of Eastern and European ancient histories. But, there are many arguments even for the Roman Slave Uprisings.

K. J. Kautsky says, regarding the slave uprisings, "As they were mostly formed of barbarous, ignorant people, they did not have enough ability to destroy the mighty state system and build a new state system. (Japanese Translation, p.86)

H. Tamaki says, "Even if slaves would have achieved victory, slavery system had been rooted deep down in all along the coast of the Mediterranean Sea at that time, so it is unthinkable that they could build a new society on the foundation of free labour for themselves." (p.80.) Thus, he points out the impossibility of slaves to build a new society. If we proceed our arguments still more, in the end, it will come to an opinion that slaves had to be turned into slave owners. For instance, H. Ohta says, "When revolted slaves tried to build an everlasting society, they also had to be slave owners. Here is the limitation of the progress of ancient society, in itself." Regarding the speech at the Meeting of 'The Textbook of Political Economy of U.S.S.R.' *Rekishigaku Kenkyu*, no.189, p.41.

E. Ciccotti, *Il tramonto della schiavitù*, Udine, 1940, p.34 also says, "Se Euno e Spartaco fossero riusciti, temporaneamente e localmente, vincitori, sarebbe stato da aspetarsi... un capovolgimento piuttosto che un mutamento intrinseco della situazione. Gli antichi padroni avrebbero perso il luogo degli antichi schiavi assunti ora al loro posto." And E. W. Walbank, *The Awful Revolution*, Liverpool, 1969, pp.112-113, thinks, "In fact, the material basis of ancient culture was inadequate for the consolidation of such a revolution, even if it could have succeeded: success must have meant chaos, and the end of the classical heritage. Indeed, even granting for argument's sake that the oppressed classes could anywhere have seized power and held it, there is no reason to think that they would have aimed at a more equalitarian form of society; the whole of classical history renders it infinitely more likely that they would merely have attempted to reverse places with their late oppressors."

Soviet historians are probing more deeply into the theoretical study of this problem. O. O. Krjuger, *Diviženija antičnych rabov v doëllinističeskiju epochu*, *IGAIMK* 101, 1934 pp. 117-118, thinks that "Receiving the title of King, ... Eunus called himself by a name of Hellenistic monarchies, and didn't think of destroying organization of slavery system. He fancied of decreasing the exploitation by striving against Roman and Carthaginian structure with a little variation of the Eastern Hellenistic structure. ... It is imaginable that the arable land, provided for such people as former slaves, and small land owners, with the use of some

non-free labours. Former slave owners were expelled, but not as classes.” Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* p.172, opposes the reactionary thesis of Krjuger’s that says, “Slaves didn’t attempt to reconstruct a new slavery system.” and “The oppressed people merely tried to reverse the position to be oppressors.” He says, “Indeed, during those two Sicilian Slave Uprisings, dictators were born in the structure of local governments by slaves, and they were imitating the structure of Hellenistic despotism. But we should not confuse a mere outlook resemblance of their structures with theoretical difference.” Moreover he points out, “Ruling structure they had imitated was a completely different one in substance, because they were not the means for exploitation. In their dictatorship, we cannot find any indications in historical documents that slaves had any intention other than trying to struggle with slave owners.” (p.172.)

Although Walbank’s theory of slaves turning into slave owners is only a presumption, those arguments by Soviet historians are based on the facts of Sicilian Uprisings at any rate. Even though both Krjuger and Kovalev are unavoidably one-sided, Kovalev’s claim to differentiate the outlook resemblance and theoretical difference is very important.

As I described in my article about Sicilian Slave Uprisings, the dictatorship which was built by slaves after destroying their slave owners was not a mere imitation of Hellenistic despotism, but it had undoubtedly the originality of its own. This “originality” had been brought forth by the oppressed people who had taken the authority away from the oppressors by way of uprisings. And needless to say but, this should be differentiated from Hellenistic despotism in their “theoretical substance.” The point in this problem is; even though they had the “originality” as a ruling organization, this organization couldn’t help but rule over other classes with slave class as ruling class.

A. R. Korusunskij, a Soviet historian says “Even when slave uprisings achieved a success temporarily (as in Sicilia, for instance), they didn’t abolish slavery system but they only massacred their former masters, or build a governmental organization after their home countries and Roman state.” (A. R. Korusunskij, *Problema revoljučionnogo perechoda ot rabovladelčeskogo stroja k feodal ‘nomu v zapadnoj evropie, Voprosi Istorii* 1964, no.5, p.103) This opinion of Korusunskij’s should be theoretically a retreat from those of Krjuger’s and Kovalev’s. S. Lauffer, *Die Sklaverei in der griechischerömischen Welt*, Gymnasium, 1964, S.375, says, “When slaves built a state, they only imitated other system of the same period in every way.” Yet, when we refer these opinions to the actual facts of Sicilian Uprisings, we have but to dismiss them. And by K. Murakawa’s opinion, “By the facts that he called himself by the title of King Antiochos, his aim must have been building a miniature power of Syrian Kingdom which was his home country.” *World History* vol. II, Tokyo 1961, pp.281–282. underlined by author) This is nothing but a vulgarization and distortion of the opinion which takes their structure as a kind of imitation.

- (15) Doi, *Reconstructing Spartacus’ Servile War*, pp.44–45, pp.50–51
- (16) Livius XCVI; Plutarch, *Crassus* 9; Florus II, 8
- (17) As for their reasons for going down South, see R. Kamienik, *Odwrót Spartakusa i przeprawy na Sycylie. Przyczynak do powstania Spartakusa w.I 73–71 p. n. e., Annales UMCS sectio F.* vol. XV, 1960; M. Doi, *An Introduction to Spartacus Servile War*, Tokyo, 1969, pp.191–245; Kamienik, *Spartacus-Rückzug nach der Schlacht bei Mutina und misslungene Überfahrt nach Sizilien, Das Altentum* Bd. XVIII Heft. 4, 1972; Doi, *Spartacus’ Uprising* pp. 125–131.
- (18) Plutarch, *Crassus* 10; Florus II, 8; Appianus *B. C. I*, 118; Most S.94; Pareti III p.701; Bonghi pp.21–22; Ihne VI S.54; Oliva-Olivová S.100; *Storia di*

- Reggio di Calabria* I, 1908, p.112; As for the time when Spartacus began to get this idea, Mischulin, *Spartacus*, S.6; Holmes I p.159, are of the opinion that it was at going down South. But, as Oliva-Olivová S. 99, I think it is after the time of victory over Picenum on the way down South. See, Doi, *Reconstructing Spartacus' Servile War* pp. 89–90
- (19) Appianus, *B. C. I*, 120; Drumann IV S.80; Ward pp. 283–284; Holmes I p.160; Mischulin, *Posled*, p.119; Mischulin, *Spartacus* SS. 75–76; Ratner p.119; Vogt S.41; Oliva-Olivová SS. 105–106; Ollivier p.159. These historians admit Spartacus' intention as to march toward Brundisium. As for the destination of Spartacus' by sea was; according to Mischulin, it was for Greece and Thracia, and Ward and Ollivier think it as for Sicilia. Meanwhile, Bonghi p.57 says, it is not a rational course for Spartacus to go to Brundisium because if they might intend to leave Italia by sea, they could have taken ships from the coast near Bruttium. Doi, *Reconstructing Spartacus' Servile War* p.93.
- (20) Appianus *B. C. I*, 120; Plutarch, *Crassus* 11; etc.
- (21) For instance, it is told that when they tried to cross over to Sicilia, pirate ships sailed away without keeping the promise to let them borrow their ships, having just taken away the rent from them. Even after this mishap, slaves made every effort to build rafts for actualizing the program of crossing-the-strait. Florus II, 8; Sallustius IV, 30 f.
- (22) According to Cicero *Verres*, II, V, 2-4, 5-10; Plutarch, *Crassus* 10, Sicilia was not at peace. Refer to Mischulin, *Spartacus* SS. 89–93.
- (23) Plutarch, *Crassus* 10
- (24) Appianus, *B. C. I*, 111; Plutarch, *Pompeius* 24; Cicero, *De Officiis* III, 49; etc. Refer to Maróti, *Die Rolle der Seeräuberei*; etc.
- (25) Maróti, *Die Rolle der Seeräuberei* S.36; Mischulin, *Spartacus* S.94; Ollivier pp.144–145; Frank, *Survey* p.302
- (26) Maróti, *Die Rolle der Seeräuberei* S.36; Vogt S.52
- (27) As Maróti, *Die Rolle der Seeräuberei* S.34 points out, piracy was one of the main sources of slave importation as well as the battles. For more informations, see Cicero, *De Officiis* II, 49; Vogt SS.52–53; W.L. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Philadelphia, 1955 p.65; Salvioli, *Kapital* p. 83.
- (28) Livius XCIII; Appianus, *Mithr.* 71; Plutarch, *Sertorius* 28; *Lucullus* 8; Frank, *Survey* p.275, p.302; Doer, S.233, etc.
- (29) Appianus, *B. C. I*, 119; Mommsen III S.87; Ollivier p.98
- (30) Appianus, *Mithr.* 109
- (31) Plutarch, *Pompeius* 41
- (32) Appianus, *B. C. I*, 120 describes that Lucullus achieved victory over Mithridates and reached Brundisium. But this was a mistake of Appianus. He confused Terentius Varro Lucullus who had been dispatched to subjugate Thracia, with Licinius Lucullus who had been sent to subjugate Mithridates. This is also evident by Plutarch, *Crassus* 11 that says Roman Senator summoned Lucullus with Pompeius from Thracia. And also by Appianus, *Mithr.* 82–83; Cicero, *De Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 8, 21, it is evident that the other Lucullus was fighting with Mithridates at the time in Pontus and Cappadocia.
cf. Bonghi p.57; Heitland III p.14; A. A. Motus, *O datirovke načala vosstanija Spartaka*, *VDI*, 1957, 3, p.160, 164 etc.
- (33) Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* pp. 174–175; Schtaerman p.243; Krjuger p.119
- (34) Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* p.175; Ridley p.27
- (35) Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* p.175; Rakov, *K probleme razlojenija rabovladelčeskoi formačiji*, *IGAİM K* 1933, 66, pp.22–23
- (36) Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* p.173
- (37) There are many arguments about the program of Spartacus' Uprising. Ratner, p.56 doesn't think slaves had any deliberate, awakening program

which would have reformed the existing organization. Their aims were only to be liberated from slavery, revenge slave owners, and go back to their home lands to be free men again. Lauffer SS.374–375; Oliva, Sklavenaufstände S.80 agree with this opinion. Oliva S.8 stresses as there were no objectives among revolts aiming at abolishing slavery or building communistic society. Regarding this opinion, Mischulin quotes the following; “Der Sklave befreit sich, indem er von allen Privateigentumsverhältnissen nur das Verhältnis der Sklaverei aufhebt und dadurch selbst erst Proletarier wird; der Proletarier kann sich nur dadurch befreien, dass er des Privateigentum überhaupt aufhebt.” (Grundsätze des Kommunismus, *Marx-Engels Werke* 4, S.366) and he says, if Spartacus might have gained victory, he would have destroyed all the possessions of slave owners, let slaves become proletariats, and he would have assigned himself with a task of destroying private property. (Mischulin, Spart. vosst. p.40, p.89, p.140) And Protonikov says, the objectives of their revolts were the expelling of slavery economy system in exchange for economic system based on free peasants. (Kovalev, Veli vosst. p.175)

Diakov, *Istorii drevnego mira* p.621 and Brisson pp.212–218, explain the objectives of the revolt as the destruction of Roma which had been the center of slavery system. (Schtaerman, p.242) After these discussions were presented, a notable phenomenon appeared among Soviet historians. That is; Schtaerman pp.244–245 says, “Among Soviet researchers after the War, there are some who refuse to try reconstructing Spartacus’ program because, as there are only very few historical materials left, it is, they say, unreasonable to continue this experiment of likely assumptions one way or the other.” And Uttschenko, *Krizis* p.147 thinks “There aren’t any basis to be talked about on “the program” of slave revolt.” Indeed, in the descriptions of Mischulin, Protonikov or Diakov, there must have been some “assumptions” or “exaggerations.” But, it is just incomprehensible for me to give up the study about the aim and program of the uprising with such a reason as the scareceness of historical materials. This kind of agnostic tendency is just inapprehensible to me. For, except the opinion by Bonghi, p.36 such as “The slave uprising was lacking its humanistic and purposeful intention,” at least those opinions of Ratner, Oliva and Lauffer have been generally approved... and the program of the slave uprisings should be studied and probed with these opinions as the base.

- (38) Schtaerman p.243
- (39) K. Marx – F. Engels, *Die deutsche Ideologie*, *Marx Engels Werke* 3, S.46
- (40) Bömer I S.182
- (41) Lucretius I, 62–65
- (42) Petronius, *Satyricon*, 71
- (43) Herodotus 5, 7; Strabo X, 3, 16; Vergilius, *Georgica*, IV, 507–527; Plutarch, *Alexandros* 2; etc.
- (44) Plutarch, *Crassus* 8
- (45) Orph. fr. 32. c. 6–7; G. Thomson, *The First Philosophers*, London 1955, p.240
- (46) Thomson, p.244
- (47) As Florus II, 8 says, certainly Roma must have fought with all its might. Roman regular troops at the time were said to be of 12 legions. (Frank, *Survey* p.326) But, just Crassus only commanded 8 legions (by Holmes I p.159; Brunt p.114; Grant p.25, 10 legions) to settle Spartacus. That means, just Crassus’s legions only, were more legions than Sulla’s when he fought the First Mithridates War. (Ihne VI S. 53) and were comparable to those of Caesar’s when he conquered Gallia. (Holmes I p.159; Oliva-Olivová S.99; Brisson p.239) Even before Crassus, many Roman generals had been sent out to subdue Spartacus ... Lucullus and Pompeius, who had

pacified Thracian and Spanish anti-Roman struggles, also joined the legions of suppressing Spartacus' Uprising. So, they must have literally fought with all their forces together. The military forces which were directed toward the uprising must have been far over than those of regular troops. Ward p.286 says more than 400,000 soldiers were put in for suppressing the uprising. Brisson p.239 says more numbers of regular troops than the time of Caesar's conquering Gallia were put into action. Holmes I p.161 says, Roma mobilized all the usable power and all the famous generals for suppressing Spartacus. So, Korusunskij p.102 is essentially right when he says Roma mobilized all its forces.

- (48) Brisson pp. 216–217 criticizes Spartacus' Uprising as they couldn't organize any controlling authority over the regions where they had suppressed... and he defines the reason for this as the revolutionary movement by slaves were in retreating tendency after Sicilian Slave Uprisings. But, when we think over the blow they gave to Roma and also take all other things into consideration, we cannot agree with Brisson's opinion.
- (48a) Doi, *Spartacus' Uprising* pp.194–196
- (49) Kovalev, *Veli. vosst.* p.171
- (49a) Doi, *Réconstructing First Sicilian Slave Uprising*, I, pp.46–50; Doi, *Basic Characters of the Second Sicilian Slave Uprising*, pp.3–16
- (50) Ratner, *Vosstania rabov v Sicilii vo vtoroj polovine II v. do. n. é*, *UZ Karelofinskogo Universiteta*, vol. II, H. I. 1954 p.36.; Also see Doi, *A Note on the Second Sicilian Slave Revolt*, pp.172–173

ВЪСТАНИЕТО НА СПАРТАК

ПРЕДВИДИТЕЛНА ТИПОВА НА ПОХОДИТЕ

- Полоз към Азини (Кануа Метаниит — Мутина)
- Войска към Синале (Мутина Метаниит — Регина)
- Италия към Брутиум

ПРЕДВИДИТЕЛНИ МЕСТА НА СРАЖЕНИЯТА

- Победа на Спартак
- Поражение на войска от Спартаксвата войска
- Гибелта на Спартак
- Окопи на Крис и Брутиум



